

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII

HEARINGS BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE TERRITORIES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SEVENTY-NINTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

PURSUANT TO

H. Res. 236

A RESOLUTION DIRECTING THE COMMITTEE ON THE
TERRITORIES TO CONDUCT A STUDY AND INVESTIGATION OF VARIOUS QUESTIONS AND PROBLEMS RELATING TO THE TERRITORIES
OF ALASKA AND HAWAII

HONOLULU, January 7, 1946
HONOLULU, January 8, 1946
HONOLULU, January 9, 1946
HONOLULU, January 10, 1946
WAILUKU, MAUI, January 11, 1946
KALAMAULA, MOLOKAI, January 12, 1946
HOOLEHUA, MOLOKAI, January 12, 1946
KONAWAENA, HAWAII, January 13, 1946
HAWAII NATIONAL PARK, HAWAII,
January 14, 1946
HILO, HAWAII, January 14, 1946
HONOLULU, January 15, 1946
HONOLULU, January 15, 1946
HONOLULU, January 17, 1946
LIHUE, KAUAI, January 18, 1946

Printed for the use of the Committee on the Territories

UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1946

**SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE TERRITORIES OF THE
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

HENRY D. LARCADE, Jr., *Chairman*, Louisiana

JAMES J. DELANEY, New York

HOMER D. ANGELL, Oregon

GEORGE P. MILLER, California

DEAN P. TAYLOR, New York

JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON, Hawaii

IRWIN W. SILVERMAN, *Counsel*

CONTENTS

WITNESSES

JANUARY 7, 1946

	Page
Ingram M. Stainback, Governor of Hawaii, chairman of Equal Rights Commission-----	10, 11
William H. Heen, senator-----	20
Roy A. Vitousek, chairman, Territorial Republican Central Committee-----	22, 622
Samuel W. King, former Delegate-----	30
E. E. Black, director of civilian defense-----	47, 551
Andrew W. Lind, professor of sociology-----	55, 559

JANUARY 8, 1946

Nils P. Larsen, president, Honolulu County Medical Society-----	69, 560
Charles Wilbar, president, board of health-----	76
Colin G. Lennox, president, board of commissioners of agriculture and forestry-----	88, 632, 633
Ralph Elliott, University of Hawaii-----	95
E. C. Auchter, president, Pineapple Research Institute of Hawaii-----	100, 561
Henry A. White, president, Hawaiian Pineapple Co., Ltd-----	105
Chauncey B. Wightman, secretary, Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association-----	108, 563
Newton B. Holcomb, director, United States Employment Service-----	118
Ernest H. Norback, representative, United States Department of Labor-----	122
I. Q. McComas, director, department of labor and industrial relations-----	124, 625
W. H. Loper, supervisor, department of public instruction-----	129, 565
Jack W. Hall, regional director, International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, CIO-----	131
Ruben Ortiz, president, Central Labor Council, AFL-----	137

JANUARY 9, 1946

Robert H. Lloyd, chairman, Hawaii Housing Authority-----	143
Benjamin F. Rush, superintendent of public works-----	148
A. Lester Marks, commissioner of public lands-----	155
C. Nils Tavares, attorney general of Hawaii-----	168, 594, 635
Gilbert G. Lentz, director, legislative reference bureau-----	174
Gerald R. Corbett, secretary of Hawaii-----	177
William Borthwick, tax commissioner-----	183
Campbell C. Crozier, deputy tax commissioner-----	194
Walter D. Ackerman, Jr., treasurer of Hawaii-----	203
Joseph Dickson, auditor of Hawaii-----	204

JANUARY 10, 1946

Chuck Mau, member, board of supervisors, city and county of Honolulu-----	207, 566
Hal F. Hanna, representative-----	217
David M. Kaapuawaokamehameha-----	238
John F. Stokes-----	241
Levi Ezera, minister-----	250
Martin E. Alan, writer-----	253, 568
William H. Tilley, Territorial employee-----	257
Hattie L. S. Reinhardt-----	260
Charles O. Maschke, carpenter-----	262
A. W. Van Valkenburg, businessman-----	263

JANUARY 11, 1946

	Page
Reuben Goodness, representative.....	269
Clarence A. Crozier, senator.....	275
Louis M. Fernandez, veteran.....	282
K. K. Kam, international executive committee, ILWU.....	284
Harold W. Rice, senator.....	289
Manuel G. Paschoal, representative.....	293
Arthur D. Woolaway, Maui Agricultural Co.....	295

JANUARY 12, 1946

Julian R. Yates, executive secretary, Hawaiian Homes Commission.....	297
George P. Cooke, ex-senator.....	299
Frank H. West, chairman, Hawaiian Homes Commission.....	305, 573
Eugene H. Beebe, member, Hawaiian Homes Commission.....	311
Victor S. K. Houston, member, Hawaiian Homes Commission.....	314, 507
Manase Makekau, representative.....	320, 513
Ernest Uu, homesteader.....	321
Gustav Nihoa, homesteader.....	323
Marian Peters, housewife.....	325
Esther Richardson, representative.....	330
Francis K. Aona, representative.....	332
Shunzo Ushiroda, ex-representative.....	335
Donald F. Bowman, businessman.....	337
G. Howard Barrett, principal, Kalahoa Public School.....	340
Abner T. Longley, plantation manager, Hawaiian Pineapple Co.....	349

JANUARY 14, 1946

Edward S. Wingate, superintendent, Hawaii National Park.....	353
Eugene S. Capellas, president of senate.....	356
Gustavus D. Supe.....	366
Robert Baldwin, teacher, Hilo High School.....	367
Michael O. Cunningham, police officer.....	368
Joseph G. Andrews, representative.....	370
William T. Nobriga, representative.....	372
Tom T. Okino, attorney.....	375
Mrs. Duncan Campbell, housewife.....	377
Heaton L. Wrenn, president, Bar Association of Hawaii.....	380, 576
Gregg Sinclair, president, University of Hawaii.....	386, 633
Oren E. Long, superintendent, department of public instruction.....	393
John H. Wilson, director of public welfare.....	399, 593
Farrant Turner, Col.....	403, 599
D. Hebden Porteus, representative.....	413
Robert Shivers, former director of FBI in Hawaii.....	403, 599
H. P. Faye, president, Honolulu Chambers of Commerce.....	414, 608
Roy L. Kessner, president, retail board, chamber of commerce.....	419
Stanley Kennedy, president, Inter-Island Steam Navigation Co., and Hawaiian Airlines.....	422, 609
Nettie Alameda, student.....	430
Adna G. Clarke, Col., United States Army, retired.....	432
John C. Jacobs, war worker.....	435
Thomas K. Maunupau, Territorial employee.....	439
Robert England, war worker.....	442
Richard M. Kageyama, veteran.....	446
Oscar Smith, war worker.....	451
Walter Mihata, veteran.....	457
John W. McFayden, war worker.....	461
Masao Yamada, Chaplain, Army of United States.....	462
Sam Van Culin, Jr., student.....	465
Theodore Burgess, businessman.....	468
F. J. De Clerq, war worker.....	470
Arthur Rutledge, labor representative.....	474
Alice Kamokila Campbell, senator.....	481
James McEldowney.....	511
Clement Gomes, senator.....	517

CONTENTS

V

	Page
Alice Faye, housewife.....	522
A. Q. Marcallino, representative.....	527
M. S. Henriques, representative.....	530
William Paia, ILWU, Local 149, CIO.....	536
Noboru Miyake, automobile dealer.....	537
William Fernandes, theater manager.....	539
Yutaka Hamamoto, agriculturist.....	540
Howard B. West, president, Kauai Junior Chamber of Commerce.....	542
Shizuo Tsuchiya, school teacher.....	543

APPENDIX

Report of Subcommittee on Statehood for Hawaii.....	546
Statements.....	551
Exhibits.....	643
Index.....	909

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII

MONDAY, JANUARY 7, 1946

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE TERRITORIES,
Iolani Palace, Honolulu, T. H.

The committee met at 10 a. m., Hon. Henry D. Larcade (chairman), presiding.

Present: Representative Henry D. Larcade, Louisiana, chairman; Representative James J. Delaney, New York, member; Representative George P. Miller, California, member; Representative Dean P. Taylor, New York, member; Representative Homer D. Angell, Oregon, member; Delegate Joseph R. Farrington, Hawaii, member; Irwin W. Silverman, Esq., chief counsel for House Territories Subcommittee; Hon. A. G. M. Robertson, chief counsel for Equal Rights Commission, Hawaii; C. Nils Tavares, Esq., attorney general, Hawaii; Miss Rhoda Lewis, assistant attorney general, Hawaii.

Chairman LARCADE. This meeting will now come to order. This is a meeting of the Subcommittee of the Territories Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States, duly appointed by the Hon. Hugh Peterson, Democrat, of Georgia, chairman of the Territories Committee, under authority of the resolution of the House of Representatives of the United States on April 30, 1945, copy of which is filed to follow this statement in the record. Attention is now directed to lines 12 to 17 of said resolution, reading as follows:

To require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee, or of any subcommittee, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman.

(The full text of the resolution follows:)

RESOLUTION

Whereas the recent trend of world affairs, including rapid changes in methods of commerce, transportation, and communications, have brought to the forefront vitally important questions relating to the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii; and

Whereas the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii are evidently bound to play an increasingly important part in the various phases of the life of our Nation; and Whereas there is growing demand for a revision of the Organic acts under which these Territories are governed; and

Whereas constant requests are being made on the part of the citizens and legislative bodies of these Territories for changes in various features of their legislative, judicial, and administrative laws; and

Whereas many inquiries are being made as to the availability within the Territories of areas suitable for homesteads; and

Whereas this question of providing homesteads within the Territories, especially Alaska, for men now in the armed forces of our country, as well as for

others interested in settling within the Territories, is one of growing importance and is deserving of careful and immediate attention; and

Whereas immediate inquiry seems to be essential into the matter of establishing small businesses in Alaska, and in determining new opportunities in fishing, lumbering, fur farming, and mining industries, as well as other industrial and agricultural opportunities; and

Whereas all these matters, as well as other important questions relating to these Territories which will most likely arise during the years immediately following the termination of the war, warrant a most careful study of the laws and policies by which these Territories are governed and the need for revision of these laws and policies in order to meet changed conditions; and

Whereas it has been many years since the Congress has had a thorough survey made of the conditions generally as they prevail in these Territories; and

Whereas, in order for the Congress to give proper consideration to all of these matters, it appears most advisable that the Congress have a more intimate knowledge of the existing conditions within the Territories: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Committee on the Territories, acting as a whole or by a subcommittee or subcommittees, is authorized and directed to conduct a study and investigation of the various questions and problems relating to the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session), as soon as practicable during the present Congress, the results of its investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable. For the purpose of this resolution, the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or of any subcommittee, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman.

Chairman LARCADE. The committee appointed, and who are here present, and who will now be introduced, consist of the speaker, Henry D. Larcade, Jr., Democrat, of Louisiana, chairman; James J. Delaney, Democrat, of New York; George P. Miller, Democrat, of California; Homer D. Angell, Republican, of Oregon; Dean P. Taylor, Republican, of New York. Also accompanying the committee is your Delegate from Hawaii, the Honorable Joseph R. Farrington, Republican, a member of the Territories Committee, and who requires no introduction here, and who it is now my pleasure to introduce at this time. Through the courtesy of the Department of the Interior, Mr. Irwin Silverman has been delegated to accompany the committee in the capacity of general counsel, and I am pleased to introduce to you at this time Mr. Silverman.

My friends, we have just come through the most terrible, bloodiest, and costliest war in the history of our country. No part of our country has suffered as directly as did this Territory from the very beginning at Pearl Harbor. The people of our country will never forget that date of infamy, and the courage, loyalty, and sacrifices of the people and military personnel who died and suffered here in Hawaii, our first line of defense, and the part that they contributed in the victorious culmination of the war. Therefore, this committee realizes that the questions which we are here to consider are of great importance to the people of this Territory. Foremost is the question of statehood for the Territory.

As far back as 1935 the Congress authorized the Committee on the Territories to visit the Territory for the purpose of making an investigation, and to hold hearings on the question of statehood for the Territory of Hawaii. That committee reported its findings to the

Congress, and in its report stated that it was its opinion that the situation at that time warranted an appointment of the committee of the House and Senate for giving further consideration to the problem.

In 1937 the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives appointed a joint committee to visit the Territory, which was done, and after several weeks of hearings that committee made the following recommendations, which I quote from the report of said joint committee of date, February 15, 1938, Senate Document No. 151, Seventy-fifth Congress, third session :

The proponents of statehood maintain :

That Hawaii was an independent nation for practically 100 years prior to annexation.

That Hawaii was not a new land, occupied and settled by American immigrants, nor was it acquired by conquest nor purchase.

That annexation was by voluntary action of the people and government of Hawaii; and was the consummation of the desire of the two contracting governments for a closer alliance, expressed over nearly 50 years of negotiations.

That the history of those negotiations caused the Hawaiian people to believe that their place in the Union would follow the traditional course leading to statehood.

That though annexation was by joint resolution of Congress, the latter's reference to the then pending treaty of annexation, and its own phraseology, confirmed this belief.

That the prompt organization of Hawaii as an incorporated Territory of the United States completed the purpose of annexation in accordance with the intent of both governments which were parties thereto.

That such a government has always heretofore been a prelude to admission as a State.

That the joint resolution of annexation extended American citizenship to all the citizens of the former Republic of Hawaii; and the people of Hawaii have since enjoyed all of the rights and privileges, and accepted without exception all of the duties and obligations, of American citizenship.

That Hawaii has consistently paid into the Federal Treasury its share of the cost of the National Government.

That Hawaii has fulfilled every requirement for statehood heretofore exacted of Territories.

That whatever the racial complexion of Hawaii may be was in fact already existent at the time of annexation and can hardly now be raised against its people.

That Hawaii's devotion to democratic principles, the patriotism and loyalty of its people, and the high development of its resources entitle it to a sympathetic consideration of its plea for statehood.

On the other hand, the committee desires to call attention to the following :

That the admission of Hawaii as a State presents a departure as it would be the first noncontiguous area to be admitted.

That the present form of government, under which its people have prospered, has proven efficient and adequate to the needs of Hawaii.

That there is not complete unity on the question of statehood among the people of Hawaii itself, the number for or against being difficult to ascertain without a plebiscite.

That unmistakable evidence that a substantial majority desire statehood should precede affirmative action by Congress.

That the present disturbed condition of international affairs, while not a permanent deterrent to the aspirations of the people of Hawaii, suggests the wisdom of further study and consideration of this question, and possibly the holding of a plebiscite at some future time.

That while great progress has been made by the people of Hawaii in every phase of activity, no hardships will be incurred by such delay, during which the Territory can continue its development along traditional American lines.

The committee therefore recommends that the question of statehood for Hawaii be deferred, to be further considered by the Congress on some appropriate occasion, after determination of the sentiment of its people and upon further application by them through proper channels.

The committee further recommends that the people of Hawaii be assured of the continued interest of Congress in their progress under the American flag; that as fellow citizens they be assured of the same treatment as the people of the several States: that the status of Hawaii as an integral part of the Union and an incorporated Territory of the United States be recognized in all national legislation; that its industries and products receive the same treatment accorded those of any other part of the Nation; and that its people be reassured that the established practice of the United States, as repeatedly affirmed in the platforms of both national parties and carried out in practice by the Federal Government, of granting the largest degree of local self-government to its Territories, will continue, until such time as the question of statehood may be reexamined.

Furthermore, the committee recommends to the Legislature of Hawaii consideration of the various matters to which attention has been called in the preceding discussion.

In 1940 the Territory, in conformity with the recommendations of the aforesaid congressional committee, held a plebiscite, resulting in a vote of 2 to 1 in favor of statehood. With the termination of the war, and due to changes which have occurred in the Territory since the report of that committee, the Territorial Legislature of Hawaii adopted a resolution, which was transmitted to the Congress, through its delegate, the Honorable Joseph R. Farrington, wherein it was requested that the Congress again authorize the appointment of a committee to visit the Territory again and to make investigations and to hold hearings to determine whether or not it is now the opportune time again to consider the question of statehood for Hawaii, as well as other pending legislation or other matters affecting the Territory. For the record, a copy of the said resolution of the Territory's Legislature is submitted to be included at this point.

(Copies of resolutions follow:)

[S. Res. No. 75]

RESOLUTION

Whereas the Territory of Hawaii is an integral part of the United States of America, has enjoyed an enlightened form of constitutional government under the best traditions of Anglo-American concepts of freedom for more than one hundred years, and, in the long period of years since annexation to the United States of America, has demonstrated its unity with the Nation, its devotion to the national ideals, and its full capacity for self-government; and

Whereas the people of this Territory have by plebiscite demonstrated their overwhelming desire that Hawaii become a state through the customary procedure by which the Congress has elevated other Territories to statehood; and

Whereas the Legislature of this Territory has repeatedly addressed the Congress asking that statehood be granted, thus carrying out the known and expressed sentiment of the people of Hawaii; and

Whereas provision has been made by this Legislature to invite visits of congressional committees and groups to the Territory, to acquaint the Congress of the United States with conditions and issues vitally affecting Hawaii in its relations to the National Government and to the Congress: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the twenty-third session of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, That this Senate does hereby express its complete belief in and support of statehood for Hawaii at the earliest possible moment; that this Senate does hereby urge the Congress of the United States to take the steps necessary to elevate this Territory to a State; and that an invitation be, and it is hereby, extended to the Committee on Territorial Affairs of the Senate of the Congress, to the Committee on the Territories of the House of Representatives of the Congress, or to such subcommittees thereof, respectively, as may be appointed, asking them to visit Hawaii upon the first opportune occasion to give further study and impetus to the program of statehood, and to give attention

to any other matters of congressional interest and concern in Hawaii; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Secretary of the Interior, to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America, to the Committee on Territorial Affairs of the Senate of the Congress, to the Committee on Territories of the House of Representatives of the Congress, and to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii.

THE SENATE OF THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII.

HONOLULU, T. H., May 4, 1945.

We hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was this day adopted by the Senate of the Territory of Hawaii.

E. S. CAPELLAS,
President of the Senate.
ELLEN D. SMYTHE,
Clerk of the Senate.

[H. R. 96]

RESOLUTION

Whereas the Territory of Hawaii is an integral part of the United States of America and for a long period of years has demonstrated its ability for self-government; and

Whereas the people of this territory have by plebiscite demonstrated their overwhelming desire that Hawaii shall become a State through the customary procedure as authorized by the Congress; and

Whereas provision has been made by this legislature to invite visits of congressional committees and groups to the Territory, to acquaint the Congress of the United States with important conditions and issues affecting the relations of the Territory to the Naional Government and to the Congress: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Twenty-third Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:

1. That this house express its complete belief in and support of statehood for Hawaii at the earliest possible moment.

2. That this house urge the Congress of the United States to take the steps necessary to elevate this Territory to a State.

3. That the Governor be requested to immediately extend an invitation to the Committee on Territories of the National House of Representatives, and to any other Members of Congress whom it may appear appropriate to include, to visit Hawaii upon the first opportune occasion to give further study and impetus to the program of statehood, and to give attention to any other matters of congressional interest and concern; and be it further

Resolved, That duly certified copies of these resolutions be forwarded to the President of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to the Delegate to the House of Representatives of the United States from Hawaii, and to the Governor of the Territory of Hawaii.

THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII.

HONOLULU, T. H., May 4, 1945.

We hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was this day adopted by the House of Representatives of the Territory of Hawaii.

M. G. PASCHOAL,
Speaker, House of Representatives.
O. P. SOARES,
Clerk, House of Representatives.

Chairman LARCADE. This committee is now ready to proceed under the authority, and subject to the resolution of the Congress hereinbefore recited. In order that there may be no misunderstanding in regard to the procedure of this committee, and for the information of the public and all interested parties, the committee desires to announce that any official of the territory, any representative of any public, private,

civic, fraternal, or industrial group or organization, or any citizen, individual, or other interested party or parties, are invited to appear, testify, and present their views in person or to file briefs or statements before the committee on any problem or subject under consideration by the committee at this time.

However, we wish to call to your attention the fact that the committee has been authorized to make investigations and hold hearings solely in regard to the question of statehood for the Territory of Hawaii, and on other legislation pending in the Congress with respect to the affairs of the Territory. It must be borne in mind that, due to the limited time at the disposal of the committee, due to the fact that Congress will reconvene on January 14, at which time the members of the committee should be present, due to the important legislation affecting their districts and the Nation at large, that the committee has decided that it will not be possible to hold hearings beyond January 20, on which date the committee plans to return to Washington. Therefore, in view of the large number of interested parties it is expected will desire to appear before the committee, under the circumstances the time allowed for each witness or appearance must necessarily be restricted, and the committee will determine the time to be allocated to each witness appearing before the committee. The committee requests that each witness cooperate by directing his or her testimony to the subjects under consideration by the committee. In the event that a witness is unable to present his or her views fully within the time allowed, the committee may grant the witness additional time, and it will be in order, and the committee will request that a further detailed supplementary statement or brief be filed with the committee, to be included in the record. Witnesses appearing before the committee will be prepared to be interrogated by the chairman and all members of the committee. The committee will hold hearings at all important points in the Territory, and the dates and places have been previously tentatively announced in the public press. However, for the record, I now file at this point the tentative schedule announced in the press, as well as an agenda of the various subjects and witnesses which have been agreed upon by the committee at this time.

(Tentative schedule of hearings and agenda follow:)

January 7: Hearings open in throne room at Iolani Palace, 10 a. m.

January 8 to 10: Hearings continue at the throne room.

January 9: Governor's reception for visiting group.

January 11: Group flies to Molokai for inspection of Hawaiian Homes Commission project, for lunch and for a hearing. Will continue to Maui that afternoon.

January 12: Hearing at county courthouse, Wailuku, Maui. Group departs for Hawaii by air in the afternoon.

January 13: Group will go from Hilo to Kona, returning to Hilo next morning.

January 14: Hearing to be held in courthouse at Hilo. Group flies back to Honolulu in afternoon.

January 15 to 17: Hearings continue in Iolani Palace.

January 17: Group entertainment sponsored by Honolulu Chamber of Commerce.

January 18: Group leaves by air for Kauai for hearing at Lihue Courthouse.

January 19: Group returns from Kauai.

January 20: Group departs for mainland.

PROPOSED AGENDA OF HEARINGS ON STATEHOOD BILL

MONDAY, JANUARY 7

MORNING SESSION

Preliminary and introductory remarks

1. Chairman, House of Representatives subcommittee.
2. Chief counsel, Equal Rights Commission.
3. Governor.
4. Representatives of the Territorial Democratic Party.
5. Representatives of the Territorial Republican Party.

AFTERNOON SESSION

People—population trends—war record

1. Samuel Wilder King, former Delegate to Congress (composition and character of the people of the islands, their history, relationships, and war records on the fighting fronts).
2. E. E. Black, director of the Office of Civilian Defense (contribution by the people of the Territory to the war on the home front—civilian defense).
3. Andrew H. Lind, professor, University of Hawaii (population trends, ethnic developments).

TUESDAY, JANUARY 8

MORNING SESSION

Business, industry, trade, and commerce

1. H. P. Faye, president of the chamber of commerce (business developments).
2. Frank E. Midkiff, representative, chamber of commerce (small business opportunities).
3. Roy C. Kesner, president, retail board (retail trade).
4. Representative of Pineapple Growers' Association (pineapple industry).
5. Representative of Hawaii Sugar Planters' Association (sugar industry).

AFTERNOON SESSION

Labor

1. Newton R. Holcomb, director, United States Employment Service (employment opportunities).
2. L. Q. McComas, director, Department of Labor and Industrial Relations (functions of the Department of Labor and Industrial Relations of the Territory and labor legislation).
3. W. H. Loper, chairman, Hawaii Employment Relations Board (formerly cochairman, War Labor Board) (scope of the 1945 act).
4. Jack W. Hall, CIO representative (activities of CIO).
5. John Owens, A. F. of L. representative (activities of the American Federation of Labor).

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 9

MORNING SESSION

Organization of government and fiscal matters

1. Dr. Gilbert G. Lentz, director, Legislative Reference Bureau (summarizing organization of government).
2. William Borthwick, tax commissioner (tax structure).
3. Walter D. Ackerman, Jr., treasurer (fiscal relations of Territory and counties—bonded indebtedness).
4. Joseph Dickson, auditor (analysis of revenues and disbursements).
5. Supervisor Chuck Mau, representing the city and county of Honolulu (county government).

AFTERNOON SESSION

Agriculture and land

1. Colin Lennox, president, board of commissioners of agriculture and forestry (agriculture and fishing).
2. A. Lester Marks, commissioner of public lands (land tenure and utilization).
3. C. Nils Tavares, attorney general (work of the land laws revision commission).
4. Julian R. Yates, representative of Hawaiian Homes Commission (on the operation and administration of the commission).

THURSDAY, JANUARY 10

MORNING SESSION

Education, health, and welfare

1. O. E. Long, superintendent, department of public instruction (education in the public schools).
2. Gregg M. Sinclair, president, University of Hawaii (the university).
3. Dr. Charles L. Wilbar, president, board of health (health conditions).
4. John C. Wilson, director, public welfare (standards of public welfare administration).
5. Robert H. Lloyd, chairman of the Hawaii Housing Authority (housing projects).

AFTERNOON SESSION

Miscellaneous topics

1. C. Nils Tavares, attorney general (law enforcement).
2. Heaton L. Wrenn, president of the Bar Association of Hawaii (analysis of Hawaiian legislation).
3. Gerald R. Corbett, secretary of Hawaii (suffrage).
4. Benjamin F. Rush, superintendent of public works (highways, airways, and harbor facilities).

Chairman LARCADE. The general counsel of the committee, Mr. Silverman, has preceded the arrival of the committee by several days, to make preparations for these hearings, and a large number of witnesses have indicated their desire to appear before the committee and have listed their names with the general counsel of the committee, and will be heard in the order of their request. However, this will not preclude any others from appearing before the committee by arrangement or by request in open meeting. Since there will, no doubt, be many witnesses who will appear before this committee who have furnished testimony with respect to statehood for Hawaii before previous committees of the Congress, and which testimony is included in the record and report of these hearings before the committees aforesaid, this committee will request those witnesses appearing before this committee to refrain from such testimony previously given, and to restrict their testimony to changes, additions, and new information or facts that have developed since they have last testified before a committee considering the subjects under discussion, the purpose of this hearing being to bring the subjects being considered up-to-date to be submitted to the Congress for such action as that body may deem proper.

The Equal Rights Commission, created by the Territorial Legislature of Hawaii, for the purpose of study in furthering statehood for the Territory, we are informed, is prepared to present a number of witnesses advocating statehood for the Territory, and we are further informed that the commission is represented here today by Judge A. G. M. Robertson, and we will now call upon Judge Robertson as the first witness, who will be allocated 10 minutes, and who will thereafter present any other witnesses for testimony on behalf of the commission, all of whom will be allocated 5 minutes each.

(At the suggestion of Mr. Silverman, during the afternoon session, it was agreed by the committee that the statement of the Secretary of the Interior, Hon. Harold L. Ickes, and the statement of the Governor of the Territory of Hawaii, Hon. Ingram M. Stainback, which were printed in the Honolulu Star-Bulletin of December 22, 1945, be incorporated in the record at this point.)

WASHINGTON, December 22.—The text of Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes' statement recommending statehood for Hawaii:

The Department of the Interior advocates statehood for Hawaii. Self-government is the right of all peoples and statehood is the framework of self-government most appropriate to Hawaii's economic and social situation.

Politically it is the next logical step, and the islanders have demonstrated it is a step they are willing and able to take.

Hawaii was annexed to the United States at its request in 1898, and the Congress in 1900 made it an organized incorporated territory. In providing for this type of governmental organization, the Congress indicated its intentions clearly.

Hawaiians entered the Union with all of the rights and obligations of other United States citizens, and Hawaiians were given a form of government which has been, in reality, provisional statehood.

Hawaii and the mainland have maintained close economic ties. Hawaii has imported from the mainland most of the consumer goods and exported to it most of the products of its two major industries, sugar and pineapples.

In the past 5 years, the average annual value of its imports from the United States has been \$165,000,000, while it has supplied the mainland during that period with sugar, pineapples, and other products averaging in value \$102,000,000 annually.

The tax payments to the Federal Treasury from Hawaii exceed in volume those of any one of some 14 States.

Its social connections with the mainland are close, partly as a result of business interests, and partly because Hawaii is known to many mainland residents who have vacationed there.

The enormously expanded defense activities during the war brought to the Territory thousands of mainlanders in addition to the many thousands of military personnel stationed there.

A not inconsiderable number of these persons will remain in, or return to, Hawaii, bringing with them knowledge, experience and appreciation of the responsibilities of statehood.

In the political field Hawaiians are well advanced. Although they have not been entitled to elect their chief executive, some 85 percent of the adults in a total population of approximately 500,000 persons have the right, as United States citizens, to vote for the Delegate to Congress, for members of the Territorial legislature, and for other local officials.

Through their franchise these citizens indicated their strong desire for statehood by voting two to one in favor of such a course in 1940.

The advent of the war postponed serious congressional consideration of their desires, but the record of the people of Hawaii during the war clearly indicates that further postponement will be unnecessary.

In contribution of personnel to the armed services, in military and naval construction, in civilian defense activities and in their willingness to undergo the inconveniences and hardships consequent on their strategic geographical position, the people of Hawaii conducted themselves in a manner of which they may well be proud.

Despite the highly cosmopolitan composition of the population, in which many racial groups are represented with distinct traditions and customs, the people of Hawaii live and function as a unified American community.

There has been little evidence of bloc voting along racial lines. Many of the problems which confront communities or States on the mainland are present in the Territory, such as the charge that the Territorial legislature has been unduly dominated by particular economic groups.

The people of Hawaii are well prepared to meet and solve such problems in the same manner as voters in the States. They are fully aware that statehood will bring to them new obligations and responsibilities, which they are ready to accept on a parity with other States. These obligations include providing the facilities which the people require for economic and social development and the financial resources to procure and maintain them.

The Department of the Interior, in cooperation with the Territorial government, is taking steps to aid the Territory in solving some of its problems in advance of statehood, and to prepare it for the assumption of others, believing that none of the problems, singly or together, is an insurmountable obstacle to statehood in the immediate future.

The Department has sought to improve transportation between Hawaii and the mainland and in the far eastern markets of the future, both by sea and by air, through the reduction of fares and the increase of facilities, and to encourage freedom of individual economic opportunity in industry and agriculture in the islands.

The Department is convinced that the people of Hawaii want statehood now and that they have demonstrated their ability and right to admission into the Union.

We further believe that the concentrated economic control of which some people have complained can better be handled by the people themselves under statehood with the assistance that they will have from the Federal Government.

Governor Ingram M. Stainback issued this morning at Iolani Palace, the executive building, the following statement on statehood for Hawaii, and its endorsement by Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes:

"I am extremely happy at the strong expression of esteem and confidence in the people of Hawaii presented in Secretary Ickes' indorsement of statehood for the Territory of Hawaii made in Washington this morning. Mr. Ickes has been a consistent and influential friend of Hawaii and of the rights of the people of Hawaii during his entire tenure of Cabinet office.

"No person acquainted with this Territory doubts that in size, in population, in economic resources, in political history and experience, and in the caliber and loyalty of its people, Hawaii is ready for and quite qualified for admission as a State.

"Hawaii has complete political autonomy except as to the appointment of the Governor, the secretary, and the judges. It elects a legislature whose power extends to all rightful subjects of legislation not inconsistent with the Constitution and the laws of the United States, locally applicable; yet we have no security guaranteeing the continuance of these rights.

"Under our status as a Territory, Congress may modify or completely repeal our organic act. In fact, we have had recent attempts to place the Territory under military or naval control.

"But equally important, with security to existing rights of local self government, is a real representation in national affairs. Statehood will give Hawaii adequate representation in both Houses. This is particularly important in the Senate where we have neither vote nor voice.

"Our plea for statehood is based not on complaint that the Congress or the Executive departments have been inattentive to us in the past, but on the fact that too often their attention, while friendly, cordial, and helpful, has been the result of an appeal rather than the result of political representation.

"We who now bear all the burdens of a State, including all Federal taxes, should have the privileges of a State, particularly proper representation and votes in the Congress.

"It is now appropriate, and I should like to see, steps taken for the passage of an enabling act by the Congress preliminary to the calling of a constitutional convention and the drafting and adoption of a constitution for the State of Hawaii.

"It is my feeling that such a constitution should be based upon the excellent foundation afforded by the territorial organic act and under which this Territory has operated successfully. The Constitution should interfere as little as possible with the existing laws and institutions authorized and set up in the Organic Act.

"I feel that I can speak for the people of Hawaii in expressing our ambition and purpose to move rapidly and continuously forward from the status of a Territory to that of the 49th state of the Union. And I look forward to making long strides toward that goal during the coming year.

"INGRAM M. STAINBACK, *Governor of Hawaii.*"

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to state that the Equal Rights Commission of Hawaii appears as a proponent of the bill for statehood which has been introduced by Delegate Farrington and is now pending in Congress, being H. R. 3643, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session. I am not appearing here, Mr. Chairman, as a witness.

I have been designated by the Equal Rights Commission to appear as chief counsel for the proponent, and if that is satisfactory to this committee I will act in that capacity.

Chairman LARCADE. Is that satisfactory?

(All committee members nod assent.)

Chairman LARCADE. Perfectly satisfactory, Judge.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Thank you. The last hearing on the subject of statehood for Hawaii was held in this room in 1937. As I understand it, the exhaustive record and report of that joint committee which was here at that time is available to this committee.

Chairman LARCADE. That's correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That record contains much statistical information, and that information has now been brought down to date. We also submit to the committee evidence, oral and written, covering the war period and covering present conditions in Hawaii.

The proponent expects to convince this committee that the people of Hawaii are fully capable of self-government, that they are now entitled to full rights of American citizenship, and that the time has now arrived when Hawaii should be admitted into the Union as the forty-ninth State. We present Ingram M. Stainback, Governor of Hawaii.

Governor STAINBACK. Mr. Chairman, Members of the Subcommittee, I have prepared a statement which will be submitted after my oral statement, according to the wishes of the committee.

I think we are very fortunate in having Judge Robertson to represent the Equal Rights Commission. I am appearing more as chairman of the Equal Rights Commission than as Governor.

As your chairman has stated, this commission was created by the Legislature of Hawaii in 1935. Its primary purpose is to support the movement for admission of the Territory to statehood. The appointed members of the commission are Miss Marguerite K. Ashford, Judge A. G. M. Robertson, Mr. Riley H. Allen, Mr. Arthur K. Trask, and Mr. Fred Patterson. Judge Robertson was designated by the Equal Rights Commission to present the testimony at this hearing. We are glad to have Judge Robertson as counsel; he has had a distinguished career. Born in Hawaii, he is the son of a former justice of the Supreme Court of Hawaii. He was a delegate to the constitutional convention of 1894, and in 1895 was a deputy attorney general of the Republic of Hawaii. He has been a member of the House of Representatives of the Republic of Hawaii and of the Territory of Hawaii. Judge Robertson is a former judge of the United States District Court for Hawaii and was chief justice of the supreme court of Hawaii from 1911 to 1918. He is the dean of the Hawaii bar.

The case for statehood will include as complete a presentation as time permits of the social, economic, and political structure of Hawaii. Statistical data have been gathered by the commission, which called upon the legislative reference bureau of the University of Hawaii to assist it. This material was gathered from many sources, and complete cooperation was accorded by all concerned. I am presenting this data to you as a series of numbered exhibits, covering area, population, Federal revenues and expenditures, finances of the Territory and its political subdivisions, business, labor, education, suffrage, health, and welfare. Witnesses on these subjects will be produced,

and there will be an exhibit of volumes some two or three inches thick, which will include in a simple form most of the statistical information. [Exhibits No. 1 to 15, inclusive.]

Eight years have passed since a committee of the Congress came to Hawaii to investigate the proposed admission of this Territory as a State. In the interval, two events have transpired which put a new aspect on the entire subject.

The first was the plebiscite held at the Territorial election of November 1940. It answered with finality the question often previously raised as to whether the people of the islands desire to become a State. The vote was 2 to 1 in favor of seeking admission, and I do not believe that it would be any less today.

The second, and by far the more important of the two events, was World War II.

The war began with an enemy assault on Hawaii, and the Territory remained the only major part of the Nation to be subjected to direct, destructive attack. For months it was compelled to endure the strain of expectation that another such attack would be attempted—a strain that ended only with the Battle of Midway.

This experience gave Hawaii the most direct and crucial test of loyalty that any unit of the Nation endured. The test was met. Hawaii furnished a substantial quota under selective service. By voluntary enlistment, it raised a battalion of infantry which finished the war with an outstanding record and was one of the most decorated units of the American Army. Hawaii was prepared on the home front when the attack came, and the record made by the civilian population cannot be equalled anywhere in the Nation. I regret to say that the record of our civilian population on the day and after the attack is not as well known throughout the country as it should be.

These facts, I repeat, give an entirely new aspect to the matter of statehood. They refute categorically the only two points which have ever seriously prejudiced Hawaii's case. The vote in the plebiscite put to rest all doubt as to the desire of its people for the honor of statehood, and by the ordeal of war, they have proved their worthiness to attain that honor.

I turn now to a brief presentation of the historical and legal background, the qualifications of Hawaii for statehood, and the reasons why Hawaii needs and should have statehood.

HISTORICAL AND LEGAL BACKGROUND

The Territory of Hawaii is a group of islands in the Pacific Ocean, situated a little more than 2,000 nautical miles west of the North American Continent. The total area of the Territory, including the small outlying islands, is estimated at 6,438 square miles, an area larger than the combined area of Connecticut and Rhode Island.

For more than a century Hawaii has had constitutional government. The first constitution was established during the monarchy. It was granted by Kamehameha III in 1840. The Republic of Hawaii was established in 1894, and annexation was effected in 1898. Annexation was by voluntary action of the people and government of Hawaii, and was the culmination of many years of negotiations. I may add that Hawaii and Texas are the only two portions of the United States

that have ever come in by voluntary annexation. As early as 1854, during the reign of Kamehameha III, steps were taken by him looking toward annexation.

Annexation of Hawaii as a part of the United States was accomplished, on the part of the Republic of Hawaii, by ratification on September 9, 1897, of a treaty completed at Washington on June 16, 1897, reading in part as follows:

The Republic of Hawaii and the United States of America, in view of the natural dependence of the Hawaiian Islands upon the United States, of their geographical proximity thereto, of the preponderant share acquired by the United States and its citizens in the industries and trade of said Islands, and of the expressed desire of the Government of the Republic of Hawaii that those Islands *should be incorporated into the United States as an integral part thereof*, and under its sovereignty, have determined to accomplish by treaty an object so important to their mutual and permanent welfare.

* * * * *

Article I. The Republic of Hawaii hereby cedes absolutely and without reserve to the United States of America all rights of sovereignty of whatsoever kind in and over the Hawaiian Islands and their dependencies; and it is agreed that all the territory of and appertaining to the Republic of Hawaii is hereby annexed to the United States of America *under the name of the Territory of Hawaii.* [Italics added.]

On the part of the United States, annexation was accomplished by the Newlands Resolution of July 7, 1898, 30 Stat. 750. This, and the joint resolution annexing Texas as a State, constitute the only examples of annexation of territory by joint resolution. The Newlands resolution recites that the Government of the Republic of Hawaii has "signified its consent" to cede all rights of sovereignty in and over the Hawaiian Islands and then enacts:

That said cession is accepted, ratified, and confirmed, and that the said Hawaiian Islands and their dependencies be, and they are hereby, annexed as a part of the territory of the United States and are subject to the sovereign dominion thereof, * * *

The Newlands resolution, which effected the annexation, contemplated the enactment of an organic act. This was enacted in 1900, and Hawaii has continued under this organic act, as amended from time to time. Hawaii is an incorporated, organized territory of the United States, the organic act serving as its constitution. It resembles in every material respect the Territories which were created in the continental United States as a preliminary to statehood, the first of which was organized by the Northwest Ordinance of 1787. The Northwest Ordinance established that the ultimate destiny of a Territory of the United States is statehood.

When Congress, by the Newlands resolution, accepted the cession made on the terms that Hawaii should be incorporated into the United States as an integral part thereof and should be granted territorial status, Congress then and there committed the United States to the ultimate granting of statehood. This is well explained by the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of *O'Donoghue v. United States*, (289 U. S. 516). This case concerned the question whether the Supreme Court and the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia were constitutional courts of the United States. In holding that they were, the court had occasion to distinguish the courts of the Territories, which are legislative courts created by Congress, not having

their source in the Constitution of the United States. The character of Territorial courts, said the Supreme Court, is due to their ephemeral nature.

A sufficient foundation for these decisions in respect of the territorial courts is to be found in the transitory character of the territorial governments. In the *McAllister* case, supra (141 U. S. 174) this court * * * concluded (pp. 187—188)—“The absence from the Constitution of such guaranties for territorial judges was no doubt due to the fact that the organization of governments for the Territories was but temporary, and would be superseded when the Territories became States of the Union.” And in the concurring opinion of Mr. Justice White in *Downes v. Bidwell*, (182 U. S. 244, 293) these decisions are said to grow out of the “presumably ephemeral nature of a territorial government” (pp. 536—537).

* * * Since the Constitution provides for the admission by Congress of new states (art. IV, s. 3, cl. 1), it properly may be said that the outlying continental public domain, of which the United States was the proprietor, was, from the beginning, destined for admission as a state or states into the Union; and that as a preliminary step toward that foreordained end—to tide over the period of ineligibility—Congress, from time to time, created territorial governments, the existence of which *was necessarily limited to the period of pupillage*. * * * (p. 537).

The impermanent character of these governments has often been noted. Thus, it has been said, “The territorial state is one of pupillage at best.” *Nelson v. United States* (30 Fed. 112, 115); “A territory, under the constitution and laws of the United States is an inchoate state.” *Ex parte, Morgan* (20 Fed. 298, 305); * * * (p. 538)).

The Court pointed out that the Constitution put a different stamp on the District of Columbia, citing article I, section 8, clause 17 of the Constitution, and saying:

In the District clause, unlike the Territorial clause, there is no mere linking of the legislative processes to the disposal and regulation of the public domain—the landed estates of the sovereign—within which transitory governments to tide over the periods of pupillage may be constituted, but an unqualified grant of permanent legislative power over a selected area set apart for the enduring purposes of the general government, to which the administration of purely local affairs is obviously subordinate and incidental * * * (pp. 538—539).

In other words, the District of Columbia is a permanent suborganization of the Federal Government, and, unlike the Territories, which are merely in the state of tutelage, to become ultimately States. And that was the distinction that made the different terms of the judges of the Territorial courts as a limited term, of the District of Columbia during good behavior, as provided by the Constitution.

Under the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, therefore, Hawaii cannot be viewed as having the same destiny as the District of Columbia. This would be contrary to the Constitution. Territorial government may be continued only during “the period of pupillage.” Then statehood is Hawaii’s right.

It must be remembered that none of the other islands under the sovereignty of the United States was given Territorial status by the Congress. In a series of cases called the Insular Cases, it was established that the other islands are mere dependencies. And to which, I may also add, the Constitution does not also apply in full. There is a good deal of argument pro and con how far individuals may be protected by the Constitution. The argument above made as to the ultimate destiny of a territory of the United States applies to Hawaii and Alaska only.

It has been through no lack of effort on its part that Hawaii has thus far failed to achieve statehood. Fourteen times, either by petition or by resolution, it has brought the matter to the attention of Congress. Eight times the Territorial legislature has made appropriations to cover investigations by the Congress. On two occasions congressional committees have responded with noteworthy results.

The last investigation was made by the joint Senate and House committee which visited the islands in 1937. It was at the suggestion made in its report that the plebiscite of 1940 was held. The vote was 46,174 or 67 percent, in favor of statehood and 22,428, or 33 percent, against.

A Gallup poll was made on the mainland on the question 2 or 3 months after the plebiscite. The ratio in favor of granting statehood to the islands was almost exactly the same as in the plebiscite—2 to 1. Before the full significance of the plebiscite result could be registered in furtherance of statehood, war broke out and interrupted effective action until now.

QUALIFICATIONS OF HAWAII FOR STATEHOOD

The requisites for statehood need no better definition than was set forth in the report of the joint congressional committee of 1937.

No stronger endorsement of Hawaii's qualifications could be devised than is contained in this report. It will be submitted in full at this hearing. I take it, from your chairman, that you have already had access to it [exhibit No. 16].

Chairman LARCADE. Yes, sir.

Governor STAINBACK. This report found "that Hawaii has fulfilled every requirement for statehood heretofore exacted of Territories" but recommended that the question of statehood be deferred on the ground that a plebiscite should be held, and on the ground of the then disturbed condition of international affairs. On both of these points the intervening years have brought major developments.

AREA AND POPULATION

In area Hawaii exceeds three of the States—Delaware, Connecticut, and Rhode Island. Its population is over 500,000—larger than that of any State at the time of admission with the exception of Oklahoma. As compared with the several States at the time of the 1940 census, Hawaii exceeded the population of the States of Nevada, Wyoming, Delaware, and Vermont, and its population was nearly equal to that of four other States, and very likely does equal or exceed them at this date.

TERRITORIAL FINANCES

Territorial finances have been well managed. Exhibits on this subject have been presented to you, and testimony also will be presented. I may add, I just got this morning a report on our bonded indebtedness, which shows it has been reduced from \$29,000,000 to \$16,000,000 over the last year.

ECONOMIC STRENGTH

The gross assessed value of real property in the islands is over \$500,000,000. According to all available data, this is higher than that of any State at the time of admission, with the exception of Oklahoma.

Hawaii's internal-revenue payments to the United States Treasury totaled \$174,000,000 in 1945—more than was paid by any of 14 States. Hawaii has maintained this relative level consistently for upward of 10 years. It's not a war of prosperity, not a war baby. The percentage of the population filing individual income-tax returns for 1940 was higher in Hawaii than in 26 States.

In 1944 internal-revenue collections in Hawaii were 13 times the Federal grants to Hawaii (including expenditures in Hawaii for relief and other aid). We hear much of the great Federal expenditures down here, but we are returning to the Federal Government 13 times as much as that agency spends here.

The aggregate value of the three leading agricultural products of the islands (sugar, pineapple, and coffee) exceeds \$90,000,000. Corresponding figures have been obtained as far back as 1850 for other Territories at the time of their admission as States. They prove that, with the exception of Arizona and Oklahoma, no other Territory even approached Hawaii's present production of wealth.

Total imports from mainland United States to Hawaii in 1940 were such that Hawaii was fifth in rank among the customers of the United States. Retail sales in 1944, taxed as such by the Territory, were over \$386,000,000.

Further facts appear from the exhibits, which show that Hawaii's economy is an asset, not a liability to the Nation. I might contrast Puerto Rico, where not only do they pay nothing to the United States, and take all the internal revenue collected, but I believe cost the United States somewhere in the neighborhood of \$55,000,000 a year. Hawaii should not be confused with undeveloped areas which are beneficiaries of the Nation and hence have a dependent status.

GEOGRAPHIC POSITION

Hawaii's geographic position has contributed to its economic strength, and with modern means of transportation and communication, the geographic position is no deterrent. In fact, I believe we are closer to Washington today than Boston was at the time of the formation of the Union, and certainly much closer than your own State of Louisiana, Mr. Chairman, was at the time of its admission. The people of Hawaii are as well informed on national affairs and in as close touch with their fellow citizens as if the Territory were a contiguous area. For example, our papers receive the service of all leading news gathering agencies, carry the articles of most nationally known columnists, and through the use of a new process two well known news weeklies now appear on the stands here the same day as on the mainland.

PHYSICAL AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

That Hawaii is a modern community, maintaining a high standard in public works and government services, can be seen as you go about

the Territory. Exhibits have been presented as to various government services, and these will be supplemented by testimony. An index to the high standard of health and welfare of the people is the low death rate, which in 1943 was 7 per 1,000 population as compared with the mainland figure of more than 10, also the low maternal mortality rate, which in 1943 was below the mainland figure and has continued to decline. Another index to the development of Hawaii is the progressive attitude of the legislature and the high standard of legislation attained, which will be developed before this committee.

EDUCATION

Hawaii has well-equipped schools, and they are well attended. To an unusual degree the schools in rural areas are on a par with city schools. The attendance record is better than that of the mainland. The teachers are better paid and have a lighter pupil load than the teachers in the United States urban schools. I am talking of an average, and not of particular States. Exhibits on this subject have been presented, which will be supplemented by testimony.

LAW ENFORCEMENT

Hawaii has a splendid police system, which will be outlined for you by the attorney general. Crime statistics will be presented to show that in this respect also Hawaii qualifies for statehood.

EXERCISE OF SUFFRAGE

Exhibits on this subject have been presented, and the secretary of Hawaii, who is in charge of elections, will present this matter to you. A very large proportion of the registered voters do vote, the figure for 1944 being 85 percent. I doubt if there is a State in the Union that can equal that percentage.

PROGRESS OF LABOR

One of the very few critical notes sounded in the joint committee's report was a mildly adverse comment about the lack of pro-labor legislation. Since then many labor laws have been passed so that Hawaii now has progressive legislation and a well-organized department of labor. Hawaii has an apprenticeship program, child-labor law, minimum-wage and workmen's-compensation laws, and an unemployment-compensation law which provides more liberal benefits than any other unemployment-compensation law in the United States with the possible exception of the State of New York. I may be a little bit in error there. When I attended the governors' convention I think possibly five States, possibly Rhode Island and one or two others, may have equaled Hawaii during this last year or two. Progress also has been made in the matter of labor relations. Exhibits on this subject have been presented and will be supplemented by testimony.

TERRITORY'S PROBLEMS TODAY

Some of the problems of particular current interest in the Territory are briefly touched upon in my message to the 1945 legislature, which I am filing with the committee [exhibit No. 17].

REASONS WHY HAWAII NEEDS AND SHOULD HAVE STATEHOOD

Observers, pointing to the remarkable progress made by Hawaii since annexation, have been known to say: "You seem to have done all right as a Territory. Why change?"

This overlooks the fact that the progress of these islands has been made in spite of the disadvantages of the Territorial status—a burden they should not be compelled to bear.

It is scarcely necessary to elaborate on the handicaps of a Territory in securing due consideration for its needs from the National Government, with merely a voice in the House of Representatives and neither voice nor vote in the Senate of the Congress. I am not putting our Delegate up as a rival to Mr. Sinatra when I call him merely "a voice." I know his great influence among the Members of the House. That is due to his friendship with the House Members, but when it comes to the matter of votes, particularly the Senate, we are frequently overlooked by Congress, not intentionally, but it is just that we do not have proper representation. We have found various departments in Congress—but that does not substitute for a Senator.

As an appendix to this statement there are cited several examples of legislation which discriminated against Hawaii. The fact that the discrimination may not have been intended does not make the penalties upon the Territory less severe. And the hazard that they will be repeated remains as long as Hawaii is denied the rights and powers of a State. You will also notice that most of this discrimination was cured after 2, 4, 6 years, but in the meantime very marked discrimination—not all of it has been cured. For instance, as shown by the Jones-Costigan Act. In the mainland United States they can produce all the sugar they want. Hawaii cannot. The mainland has absolute production—not that I am condemning the Jones-Costigan Act. It has been very valuable to the Territory. So don't misunderstand my statement about the Jones-Costigan Act. I am not condemning it as such. We get benefits, but not quite as much as the mainland gets.

Twenty-five thousand young men of these islands were drafted during World War II. Yet they had no voice in the passage of the draft law, no vote in the declaration of war that sent them into battle. I say "they"—their parents or their friends or anyone. The citizens of Hawaii have paid Federal taxes, in war and in peace, on exactly the same basis as the citizens of the States. Yet they have had no voice either in levying the taxes or disbursing the revenues. In other words, we have all the burdens of the State without the benefits.

The citizens of Hawaii can cast no vote for the President, nor can they elect Senators or Representatives. They cannot vote on any amendment to the Constitution.

These conditions are contrary to traditional American principles. "No taxation without representation"—the American revolution was

fought on that principle—"no government without the consent of the governed"—are axioms as much alive and as important to the people of Hawaii today as they were to the Revolutionary fathers who first gave them utterance.

It is no answer to Hawaii's plea for statehood that Territorial government is "adequate." A century and a half of Territorial government has proved that, to the typical American, it never has been and never will be adequate. It is an inferior status repugnant to the spirit of America—tolerable for a reasonable period, but to be endured no longer than is obligatory. The people of Hawaii feel that their "period of pupilage" has been completed and that a fair consideration of their case can culminate in but one answer—statehood.

Chairman LARCADE. Thank you very much, Governor. That is a very good and most interesting statement.

Governor STAINBACK. I am filing this statement with the committee.

Chairman LARCADE. Does any member of the committee desire to ask the Governor any questions?

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Governor a question or two. Governor, categorically, what would you say are the advantages of statehood over a Territorial status?

Governor STAINBACK. The great advantage is that we would have representation in the National Government. As I say, we haven't even a voice in the Senate. We have a voice in the House, but no vote. Laws affecting our taxation, affecting our very existence—take the Jones-Costigan Act, for instance, which limited our production of sugar to 800,000 tons. Producers on the mainland were not limited, but we were limited to it, and we would be wiped out from an economic standpoint. If we had two Senators in Congress we would be entitled to be treated as a State, and no discrimination could be made.

Mr. ANGELL. If you had statehood, no discrimination would be made with respect to the introduction of your products into the United States?

Governor STAINBACK. I don't think so.

Mr. ANGELL. That characteristic that you have just mentioned really is the fundamental of American government, isn't it?

Governor STAINBACK. I think so. As I stated, we are sharing all the burdens of a State. We are bearing all the burdens of citizenship, including giving of our lives, those of our young men—and yet we have no say whatever in Congress. When Congress decides to declare war, Congress is the only body that can declare war.

Mr. ANGELL. Can you name any other advantages that you would have under statehood you do not have as a Territory?

Governor STAINBACK. Of course, we now have more or less complete local government, except with the election of a few officers and judges. I think it is a fundamental principle of self-government that communities are fit for self-government, and we believe we are. I think it is a fundamental principle that no people can govern another people better than they can govern themselves. In other words, we are governed from Washington in a great many things relating to our national affairs, and if we have to suffer the consequences, it is shown that we

are the only part of the Nation that suffered direct attack when war came on.

Mr. ANGELL. What would be the effect on your financial structure in the way of taxation?

Governor STAINBACK. Very little. Congress pays the salaries of a few of our officials, but that's inconsequential.

Mr. ANGELL. Would it make any difference on the contribution made by the Federal Government on the control of the Territory?

Governor STAINBACK. I don't see, except for these few salaries—I don't think it would make any difference at all.

Chairman LARCADE. Does any other member of the committee desire to interrogate the witness? [No response.] Well, Governor, thank you very much—very fine presentation.

(Following the testimony of Senator William H. Heen, Chairman Larcade requested unanimous consent, which was given, to have included in the record at this point a letter received by the committee from David K. Trask, chairman of the Democratic Party of Hawaii, requesting permission of the committee to have Senator Heen appear and speak on behalf of statehood for the Democratic Party.)

TERRITORIAL CENTRAL COMMITTEE,
DEMOCRATIC PARTY OF HAWAII,
Honolulu, T. H., January 3, 1946.

The CONGRESSIONAL STATEHOOD COMMITTEE,
Honolulu, T. H.

GENTLEMEN: The Democratic Party of Hawaii desires to be represented by Judge William H. Heen, Democratic national committeeman, to speak on behalf of statehood for Hawaii.

Very truly yours,

DAVID K. TRASK,
Chairman, Democratic Party of Hawaii.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, we present Mr. William H. Heen, for many years a member of the local senate, and chairman of its judiciary committee—Mr. Heen.

Mr. HEEN. Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, I got word yesterday morning, 7 o'clock in the morning, to prepare to appear here this morning with a brief. Well, I wasn't going to spend my Sundays preparing a brief. I am here to appear before you and to present my statement orally.

Chairman LARCADE. You will pardon me, sir, but that was a misunderstanding, as you have learned by this time. I am sure the committee never had any such intentions.

Mr. HEEN. It wasn't the committee, it was someone else.

Chairman LARCADE. I think the committee has made the position clear in my opening statement. You may proceed, sir.

Mr. HEEN. Inasmuch as the committee will be furnished with statistics and with information as to what our laws here are, I am not going to dwell upon those now. I do want to say that the Democratic Party of Hawaii has gone on record as being in favor definitely of statehood for Hawaii. The Democratic Party of Hawaii has had in its Territorial platform from time to time a plank advocating statehood for Hawaii, and I might state that the Democratic platform has also had a plank favoring statehood for Hawaii. That appeared in the platform of 1940, and in the national convention of 1944. I happened to be one of the delegates representing Hawaii at that convention, and

a member of the platform committee, and we advocated a statehood plank, the inclusion of a plank in the national platform favoring statehood for Hawaii, and in its original form it read that Hawaii should be granted statehood at the earliest possible moment. But the members of that committee felt that, because of the existence of war at that time, it should be toned down a little, so that what we finally got into the platform was a plank favoring eventual statehood for Hawaii.

Now, I don't want to mislead you, Mr. Chairman or members of the committee, that the Democratic Party of Hawaii had favored statehood for Hawaii alone. The Republican Party has also favored statehood, and has had planks in its national platform favoring statehood for Hawaii. But we thought that we'd go them one better by asking for one to be given at the earliest possible moment. Now that the war is over, I think we are entitled to have statehood at the earliest possible moment. Now it might interest you—I happened to pick up a pamphlet containing the platforms of the two national parties for the year 1932, and in the Democratic national platform I see this plank:

We advocate independence for the Philippines, ultimate statehood for Puerto Rico.

That's way back in 1932, and if Puerto Rico was entitled to statehood at that time or to be considered entitled to statehood ultimately, I say Hawaii should have been included there at that time also. And today we do not yield to Puerto Rico or any other section of the country as to being qualified to fulfill the requirements of statehood. We believe, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, that the people of Hawaii are fully qualified to meet all the requirements of statehood. They are entitled to all the rights and privileges of statehood, and they are willing, as they have always been willing, to abide by the obligations of a State.

In 1898, when these islands were annexed by the United States, I remember that well because I was a young man at that time and able to observe what was going on—the people of Hawaii, of Hawaiian ancestry, resented annexation by the United States. And that resentment continued for a while, but as the years passed and the Hawaiians realized the rights and privileges which were given them under the organic act, especially the right of franchise, that resentment disappeared. And they have become just as loyal citizens as you will find anywhere in the country. They yield to no section of this great Nation when it comes to loyalty and patriotism. And they will not exchange their right of American citizenship for anything else in the world. And it is my own honest belief, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, that the vast majority of the people of these islands, of Hawaiian ancestry, are definitely in favor of statehood.

There is nothing more I can add to what I have already said. I think I have made myself clear, that the people of Hawaii are entitled to statehood. They know what the obligations of a State are. They have complied with them over the years, but they are entitled to all of those things that go with a State, and they are ready and willing and are qualified to become a member of the sisterhood of States, entitled to be a sovereign State in the Nation. That's all I have to say to you, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee.

Chairman LARCADE. Thank you very much. Any questions by the committee?

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I think that for the information of the committee and the record, that it would be very valuable to have Senator Heen inform us of his record as a public official, in as far as he has been in public office in one manner or another both as an elected and appointed official over a long period of years.

Chairman LARCADE. We'd be very glad to have the senator do that.

Mr. HEEN. I'd rather have someone else tell you about it, but I became a public officer in 1910 for the first time, when I was appointed deputy county attorney in the county of Hawaii. I served there for 6 years. Then I was called to Hawaii by Governor Stainback, who was then attorney general of the Territory of Hawaii, to come to Honolulu to be a deputy attorney general under him. I served there 2 years, and then was appointed third judge of the Circuit Court of the First Judicial Circuit of the Territory of Hawaii, which is located on this island. I served there 2 years. The appointment was made by President Wilson at that time. Then I resigned my position there, to seek election to the office of the city and county attorney for the city and county of Honolulu. That was in 1919. I was elected at that time and served a period, a term of 4 years, and ran for reelection, and was reelected for a 4-year term, but I served only 2 years and I resigned from that position. I was one of those Democrats that felt that I shouldn't be tied up to public office all the time. I wanted to get out of public life and go into private life to practice my profession of law. Well, I had no sooner got out than the Democrats got after me to run for the senate. That was in 1926. And much to my amazement, I was elected. I thought I'd help the ticket out and I did, and got elected for that. Have been elected every 4 years since then—still a member of the Territorial senate as a Democrat. There were times when I was the only, the lone Democrat, the lone Democrat in the senate. There are 15 members in the senate, but I managed to get by, and there were times, because they had no lawyer in the senate, they had to appoint me chairman of the judiciary committee. I have been chairman of that committee for several sessions, starting, I believe, in 1929. And there was one session when they'd elect a Republican lawyer, and he became the chairman of that very important committee during one session. So that's my political history.

Mr. TAYLOR. Your political life in Hawaii would be less placid if you were to be admitted as the forty-ninth State in the Union, wouldn't it?

Mr. HEEN. That may be true, but don't forget this: We have a very intelligent electorate here.

Mr. TAYLOR. A very appropriate answer.

Chairman LARCADE. Any other questions, gentlemen? (No response.) Well, Mr. Heen, as a member of the Democratic Party I want to thank you for being the torch bearer for the party here. I want to say that you have certainly had a fine and honored career, which qualifies you for appearance before this committee.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, we present Roy A. Vitousek, for many years a speaker of the local house of representatives.

Chairman LARCADE. Mr. Vitousek is now recognized.

Mr. VITOUSEK. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I think probably it is rather fitting that I follow Judge Heen, because

when he was elected city and county attorney of this county in 1919, he appointed me as his chief deputy, in which position I served for 5 years. I am speaking here today, however, not as a public official, but as the chairman of the Republican Territorial committee for Hawaii, and have been designated by that committee to present the views of the party in regard to statehood.

Chairman LARCADE. Pardon me just a moment. I think you were listed—a written application was made for your appearance, was it not?

Mr. VITOUSEK. That's right.

Chairman LARCADE. If you will pardon me at this point I'd like to file for the record a copy of the request for your appearance in that capacity.

(The matter referred to is as follows:)

TERRITORIAL CENTRAL COMMITTEE,
REPUBLICAN PARTY OF HAWAII,
Honolulu 1, T. H., January 5, 1946.

HON. INGRAM M. STAINBACK,
Governor of Hawaii, Honolulu, T. H.

SIR: According to the press it is necessary for those who desire to appear before the Subcommittee on Statehood of the Territorial Affairs Committee of Congress to submit their names. The Republican Party desires to appear through its representatives in support of statehood for Hawaii. The party has appointed a special committee to represent it at the hearings consisting of the following members: Chairman, Roy A. Vitousek, Samuel Wilder King, Victor S. K. Houston, Wilfred C. Tsukiyama, Kam Tai Lee, Benjamin Dillingham, Roger McGuigan, James P. Winne, Bina Mossman, O. P. Soares.

We would like for arrangements to be made so that at the time the Republican Party is given the time to present its attitude all members of the committee can be present with whomever is chosen as its spokesman should the congressional group desire to hear from only one. The Republican Party would like to have a representative present at all of the hearings in case matters come up in regard to which it feels further evidence should be offered by it, and would greatly appreciate arrangements being made so that it could have at least two seats in order to have at least two representatives present at all hearings.

Very truly yours,

ROY A. VITOUSEK, *Chairman.*

Chairman LARCADE. You may proceed, sir.

Mr. VITOUSEK. The Republican Party has repeatedly gone on record in favor of statehood, and in order to bring their record down to date, at a recent meeting of the central committee they again passed a resolution. I'd like to leave that with the committee, showing the party's stand. [Exhibit No. 18.]

Statehood for Hawaii is not a partisan issue between the two major political parties of this Territory or of the Nation. It has not only been endorsed by both parties locally in their local platforms, it has not only been voted for by elected representatives of both parties in the Legislatures of this Territory, but it has also been endorsed by the national conventions of both parties over a long period of time. Sometimes the two major parties of America agree on matters of policy and on political issues, but of course more frequently they disagree. It is indeed gratifying to know that on a matter of such grave importance to the people of this Territory the parties agree and both are putting forth their best efforts to make Hawaii the forty-ninth State of the Union. Statehood for Hawaii has been a live issue for almost a century. It was first brought to the fore in 1853 when King Kamehameha III entered into negotiations with the representatives

of the United States for a treaty of annexation. Kamehameha III died before the treaty was signed. Upon annexation of Hawaii as a Territory in 1898, an attempt was made to provide for statehood by treaty but this was abandoned. Commencing in 1903 the legislatures of this Territory have, in practically every session, petitioned Congress for statehood and the vote for statehood was usually unanimous, both Democrats and Republicans voting "Yes."

I do not intend to present to you a lot of statistics to prove that we are entitled to be a State. Such statistics have repeatedly been collected and have repeatedly been submitted to Congress. Undoubtedly others have made these statistics current and have submitted or will submit them to you. In 1940 a plebiscite was held on this question which resulted in an overwhelming vote in favor of Statehood. The campaign for the affirmative was conducted by a joint committee composed equally of Democrats and Republicans. Samuel Wilder King, Republican, was chairman of the committee and the late Louis S. Cain, Democrat, was vice chairman of this committee. As Mr. King was in Washington as our Delegate the work of the joint committee fell largely on the shoulders of Mr. Cain and to him is entitled great credit for the successful outcome of the campaign. Speakers for statehood were both on the Republican and Democratic platforms of that year. There are many sound reasons for statehood and I have yet to hear what seems to be a sound reason against it.

To my mind the outstanding reason for statehood is the simple fact that one living in a Territory cannot exercise his full rights as an American citizen—he has no right to participate in national elections or otherwise express himself on a par with an American citizen living in a State—he is taxed without representation and laws are passed affecting his life and property by Congress without having a representative with a vote to take part in the passage of such laws, and, as a matter of fact, it is very doubtful whether the citizen of a Territory is fully covered by the Constitution of the United States. I say it is doubtful if the people of the Territory are fully covered by the Constitution for two reasons: (1) in 1934 Justice Bailey of the Federal District Court for the District of Columbia declared:

Under the territorial power of the constitution (article IV, sec. 3, clause 2) Congress may discriminate commercially against the Territory of Hawaii as a whole, even though it is an organized territory.

(2) Because in the notorious habeas corpus cases arising out of martial law the Department of Justice contended that the Constitution only applies to Hawaii to the extent that Congress makes it applicable. What Congress can give it can take away. The only way a citizen of Hawaii can exercise his full measure of American citizenship is by leaving the Territory and establishing residence in one of the 48 States. We, who have Hawaii for our home, do not care to leave it but believe we should be granted full American citizenship and that we are entitled to full American citizenship. We have been investigated and re-investigated by special congressional committees, by agencies of the Federal Government and by self-appointed investigators and in the open and undercover and except for an occasional biased report there has never been anything in substance charged against us. Probably the most thorough investigation that has ever been made of the Territory was that made by the last con-

gressional committee to visit these islands which was a Joint Committee on Hawaii of the Congress of the United States, the members of which conducted hearings in Hawaii in 1937. This committee made a report stating among other things:

1. The people of the Territory of Hawaii have accepted without exception all of the duties and obligations of American citizenship.

2. That Hawaii has fulfilled every requirement for statehood heretofore exacted for Territories.

3. That Hawaii's devotion to Democratic principles, the patriotism and loyalty of its people and the high development of its resources entitled it to sympathetic consideration of its plea for statehood.

4. The entire governmental organization for law enforcement and crime prevention, including prosecuting officers, police forces, courts, prisons, reform schools, and parole boards appears to be adequate and such changes as may from time to time be necessary may be left to the local authorities.

5. The public schools of Hawaii are the foundation of good citizenship. As a part of their curriculum they inculcate the basic principles of democracy in the youth who pass through them. With so many children of alien parentage among them, a definite program of Americanization is necessary. Too much praise cannot be given to the schools of Hawaii for the splendid manner in which they have met this problem and in the great measure of success that has attended their efforts.

I know that of late a race issue has been raised. I deplore the bringing of race into any question in Hawaii. It has been the one community in the world where peoples of all racial ancestries live together harmoniously and congenially without any feeling as to the superiority or inferiority of those of any racial group. These islands have never tolerated race prejudice as between its peoples. In recent periods of time racial intolerance that exists in some places on the mainland is beginning to spread. It would be disastrous if this spread would be allowed to continue in these islands and they who are raising the issue are performing a disservice to the very subject that they purport to be supporting—that is racial tolerance. We must live together in mutual friendship, understanding and sympathy as we have always done in the past. I have become convinced that the best way to secure ourselves against the introduction of racial animosity is to have a State governed so that the peoples of these islands may continue to govern themselves in the spirit of tolerance and mutual good will and respect that is the true spirit of Hawaii. We have too many proofs that all of our people, no matter what their racial ancestries, are loyal to the basic American principles to permit their loyalty to be questioned.

I say we have many proofs that our people, no matter what their racial ancestries may be, are loyal because of the excellent record of our people in World War II. Whether of Caucasian or non-Caucasian ancestry, they responded wholeheartedly in their support of the Nation. They joined the military forces, and no people have a better record in the armed forces; they supported bond drives, Red Cross activities, and civilian-defense activities; no sacrifice was too great for them to make; and the civilians did not complain because of shortage of butter, meat, and other desirable food. I do not make these statements from hearsay nor from cold records; because on the morning of December 7, 1941, while my son and I were flying, I found myself in the midst of the attack, and as soon as possible after I landed I volunteered my services to the police department and was in the midst of activities from then on, and was in as good position as any civilian to observe the conduct of our people under the trying

conditions of an enemy assault. I personally collected, and through Delegate King, submitted to Congress evidence completely refuting stories of sabotage and fifth-column activities. I cannot understand how any fair-minded citizen could pass through the uncertain period in Hawaii commencing with December 7, 1941, and ending with the battle of Midway and question the group loyalty of any of our people no matter what their racial ancestry.

That certain individuals were disloyal I would be foolish to deny, but such disloyal individuals in Hawaii of Japanese ancestry were no greater in proportion than disloyal individuals of Caucasian ancestry in other parts of the Nation. That there was espionage anyone would be foolish to deny, but it is interesting to note that the first person in this Territory convicted of espionage was a Caucasian of German extraction. As a matter of fact, I don't know of any other person having been convicted of espionage; if there were such the convictions were not made public. There were many wild charges made against our citizens but the records of the Honolulu Police Department, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Military Intelligence, and Naval Intelligence will show there was no sabotage. I personally think it is very important for all of us to recognize the difference between sabotage and espionage—I say there was no sabotage, but I do not deny that there was espionage. I can offer absolute proof of what I say; but, in view of the fact that records are already before Congress in the hearings conducted by the Tolan committee and now being conducted by the Pearl Harbor investigating committee, I do not believe it is necessary to duplicate such records in the hearings before this committee; however, if the committee members desire such records, I will be only too glad to furnish them at a later date.

Hawaii and the Nation both have much to gain from Hawaii becoming a State. As a State the people of Hawaii would gain the full rights of American citizenship. The United States would gain as full American citizens a large group of people who have been loyal and will continue to be loyal to the American form of government, no matter what trials and tribulations it might pass through.

For the information of the committee I would like to state that the Republican central committee has appointed a special committee advocating statehood for this committee consisting of the following:

Samuel Wilder King, Victor S. K. Houston, both of whom have served as delegates to Congress from Hawaii; Hon. O. P. Soares, member of the bar who has served as district court judge; Wilfred C. Tsukiyama, who served for many years as a city and county attorney for this County, a member of the bar; Kam Tai Lee; Benjamin Dillingham; Roger McGuigan; James P. Winne; and Bina Mossman, the last two being the national committeeman and committeewoman. I will file with the committee this statement.

Chairman LARCADE. Thank you very much, Mr. Vitousek.

Mr. DELANEY. We have heard from both of the major parties. Are there any minority parties here in Hawaii?

Mr. VITOUSEK. There is no party recognized on the ballot except the two major parties at the present time.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, there are two things that I thought Mr. Vitousek might develop. First of all, I would like to

suggest that the material he offers for the record be accepted in as far as the committee hopes to have as complete documentation of all this information as is possible. (See exhibit 67, later introduced.) I think it would be interesting to tell the committee something of your own background politically, in as far as you have had some experience in practical politics in California before you came to Hawaii, and as something of an observer of political activities both nationally and locally, should be in a position to make some comparisons.

Mr. VITOUSEK. Well, I was born in the State of California, attended public schools there, graduated from the University of California in 1912, a long time ago. On graduation, on being admitted to practice, I ran for office in a little town of Sonoma County, and was elected city clerk. After that I became interested as a member of the Progressive Party, which was then started, and became an officer in that party, at the time the late Senator Johnson was taking active part as Governor, and later as Senator, and came to Hawaii in 1917. I was engaged in the practice of law, in 1919 was appointed first deputy attorney under Judge Heen, who was elected as a Democrat. When I left that I ran for the Legislature in 1922, was elected, served almost continuously since then, except for one or two times. I was elected Speaker, and elected Speaker unanimously by both parties. I served as Speaker for several terms. I have been a delegate to several of the conventions on the mainland to discuss matters back there generally. I have in the party councils watched the activities of the State, or their requests for legislation. I believe our Legislature here is as modern, up-to-date, progressive as you will find in any State in the Union—in many respects far surpasses many States of the Union technically on matters of health and in regard to the schools.

Advocating statehood is nothing new nor sudden. I believe since I have arrived here, since I have watched the interest people take in voting, we have a larger percentage, I believe, of our people registered and voting than almost any community. They take an intelligent interest in public affairs and an active interest. We all get along pretty well together, after we are elected, no matter what party, what platform we were elected on.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Vitousek, do you know any appreciable difference in the approach of the people of Hawaii to that of the people of California to the practical problems of government?

Mr. VITOUSEK. No; in the practical aspects of government I have never noticed any great difference. My work takes me to California almost every year, and sometimes oftener, and I know a lot of the officials up there, and watch their work with great interest. I don't see any difference. As a matter of approach or, in fact, I think the big difference is the intelligent or the active interest taken by our local citizenry in matters generally. I think you see that more here than you do on the mainland.

Mr. FARRINGTON. It's also true that the pattern of our political life follows that of the States very closely?

Mr. VITOUSEK. Yes; also very closely.

Mr. FARRINGTON. As far as parties are concerned?

Mr. VITOUSEK. In almost every respect the same problems that are facing the various States you can refer to them, almost any problem they have we have here, and it's approached in practically the same

way. You have here your proponents and opponents of types of legislation, for instance the hot subject of reapportionment, I think even Congress had a long time solving it, and I don't believe there is any difference in the approach any place than what you get right in this community.

Mr. TAYLOR. I take it you subscribe to what the Senator had to say as to the ability of the people to take care of their own political affairs, vote intelligently?

Mr. VITOUSEK. I subscribe to the statement of both the Governor and the Senator in that respect, in our ability to be a state.

Mr. TAYLOR. Do you find any instances of people voting for a candidate who is nominated for public office because he has some particular racial line or origin?

Mr. VITOUSEK. Well, I don't believe that. I'll put it this way: I don't believe that anyone can be elected to office just for that reason. There are undoubtedly certain people who will vote as they do anywhere on the mainland. If you go, for instance—I remember Sam King asked me to a cocktail party in Washington. There was a Congressman there, elected, I believe, from Nebraska, where the Czech race predominated, how he got the Czech vote. Well, it is natural that certain communities, certain people will vote, but I don't believe they vote that way to the extent they can elect a candidate simply because of race. If he is elected he would be an outstanding candidate for public office, for that particular office, yes; but just because of race, no—because he is a member of a particular race.

Mr. ANGELL. I note from the agenda today that you are appearing as a representative of the Territorial Republican Party, and Judge Heen is appearing as a representative of the Territorial Democratic Party. It is true, is it not, that both parties are ardently in support of statehood for the Territory?

Mr. VITOUSEK. That is correct. They have been both in support of statehood. They jointly conducted the campaign for statehood in 1940, when we had a plebiscite, and both parties have planks for statehood and are ardently for statehood. [See exhibit 76.]

Mr. ANGELL. The appearing of the two political parties is due to the unanimity on the question of statehood?

Mr. VITOUSEK. That is correct. I think the State—I can't speak for the Democratic Party, in that regard—but the Republican Party here has conventions and elects their own officials, precinct clubs and delegations to conventions. They elect the central committee, and the central committee elects the officers, so I think we can say we speak for the membership of the Republican Party being duly elected under the democratic processes. The central committee has elected me to present its views to you gentlemen.

Mr. ANGELL. Is there a healthy adherence here in the Territory to the political system that prevails throughout the United States, of the party system?

Mr. VITOUSEK. We have the same, exactly the same, pattern of elections you do on the mainland. For instance, we have the two major parties. They each conduct campaigns. I might say they are more colorful than yours, because we have a lot of singing girls and leis.

Mr. ANGELL. We have some singers on the mainland running for office too.

Mr. VITOUSEK. But they conduct a campaign separately. Every candidate is afforded the opportunity to press his views on the public forum, which is open and openly conducted. We have, of course, had the PAC here in the last elections like you did. We have the exact patterns of elections that you do on the mainland. We have our direct primary, where the candidates are nominated, and the party in the primary simply affords them a means of expressing their views. We do not take part. When they are nominated the respective parties nominate their candidates in the general election.

(A recess was here taken until 11:37 a. m.)

Chairman LARCADE. The committee will now resume. Mr. Angell from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. VITOUSEK. I believe the question you asked, sir, was, whether or not any particular group refrained from voting.

Mr. ANGELL. By reason of racial origin.

Mr. VITOUSEK. They do not refrain from voting, nor have they refrained from voting, as the record will show. As I said at the commencement of the war, there was a lot of talk here and on the mainland, about those American citizens of Japanese ancestry running for office, and a lot of them voluntarily withdrew. Some did run. On Kauai, I believe they ran and were elected, but several withdrew from office simply because they didn't want to be the target of the military and others who were making the charges around here at the time. But they did take part in the elections and voted at the elections.

Mr. ANGELL. Are there any notable cases of concentration of racial groups together and their refraining from association and participation with others in social, political, and economic activities?

Mr. VITOUSEK. Well, sir, as far as our social life is concerned, it's just like that in any other community. You have your friends and you have those you go with a great deal. For instance, I think probably the person I see the most is a man friend—is a man of American citizenship of Chinese ancestry. In all organizations of party they are not, they are all there according to their ability. We find them of great ability, no matter what the racial ancestry. There is no concentration as such as far as districts go. Naturally, their place in the community, as far as housing goes, is dictated by economic necessity, and naturally you can rent a house at a certain figure, that will usually be in a certain district, like it is in every city. Those who can't afford it haven't the income to afford better places and will live in those. So the only grouping, I would say, was because of economic reasons.

Mr. ANGELL. Is it true that there is less appearance of racial intolerance in the islands than there is in many parts of the mainland?

Mr. VITOUSEK. Sir, I would say that there is less racial intolerance here than any place that I know in the world. We have, to my mind, solved that particular problem. There is no feeling amongst the people. We work together with them. We never think, well, this gentleman is a citizen of oriental ancestry, or of any other ancestry. We just don't think of it amongst ourselves. It never enters our thoughts when we contact our fellow citizens.

Mr. ANGELL. Is it true, that on the list of candidates at your general elections, you will find men of all racial derivation on the ballot?

Mr. VITOUSEK. That's true, sir, and I have served in the legislature, where there were men of all racial ancestry represented, and just like you find on the mainland. Some of them were not so good, not so capable, others were very good and very capable. That was true, irrespective of their racial ancestry. I can name one or several of our very best public officials who were American citizens of Japanese ancestry or of Chinese ancestry, Portuguese, and Hawaiian. We don't think of them in that way when we are in public office.

Mr. ANGELL. Thank you, Mr. Vitousek.

Chairman LARCADE. Any other questions by any other members of the committee? [No response.]

Mr. VITOUSEK. May I ask Delegate Farrington if you wanted me to amplify the record, what you mean in regard to the affidavits on sabotage?

Mr. FARRINGTON. Yes.

Mr. VITOUSEK. I'll collect them and submit them later.

Chairman LARCADE. I'd like to ask the unanimous consent of the committee, in view of the fact that Senator Heen appeared as a representative of the Territorial Democratic Party, that, preceding his testimony, I be permitted to insert in the record a letter signed by Mr. David Trask, chairman of the central committee of the Democratic Party, requesting permission for Senator Heen to appear as a representative of that party.

(Committee nods assent.)

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, we present Samuel Wilder King, United States Navy, retired.

Chairman LARCADE. We'll be most happy to have Mr. King appear at this time.

Mr. KING. May I revise and extend my remarks?

Chairman LARCADE. Yes.

Mr. KING. First, may I extend a welcome from Hawaii to you all. I feel it does a very great good to Hawaii to have a congressional committee come here. First, we try to sell ourselves to you, and next you have an opportunity to become acquainted with us. Further, it gives the community an opportunity to be heard. After all, we are at the western end of the American line, and we do not meet as many visiting Congressmen as we might. I know how hard the work of this committee will be. I have served on and accompanied several similar committees, and I know how very tiring it is.

I would like to confirm what you were quoted as saying in the morning paper, that it would have been easier to go home and have your rest, when Congress had adjourned, rather than make this trip, and be kept busy on a tight schedule.

Mr. Chairman, I suppose I have had about as much to do with the active advocacy of statehood for Hawaii as any other individual in Hawaii.

In these activities I have been associated with a large number of others, men and women, private individuals and public officials, all of whom have contributed their share of the work.

I want to emphasize that statehood has never been a partisan or class issue in Hawaii. The proponents of statehood include a majority of every group, political, economic, or racial. The opposite is true. Such opposition as exists cuts across party, class, and race lines.

I can think of no political issue that arouses such general support. Both party platforms have favored statehood; the leaders and candidates of both parties have invariably supported statehood. Organized labor has expressed itself as behind statehood. No organized group has yet appeared in opposition.

The opponents comprise in the main those who have heretofore sincerely felt that the time was not yet opportune. Of the remainder a considerable number are so blinded by race prejudice as to be beyond reason. The passage of time since the last hearings on the question, and the war record of our people, should allay the apprehensions of the former group. The latter I contend have little right to be heard in an American community, dedicated to the principle that no man shall be denied his rights as a citizen because of ancestry.

Perhaps a brief resume of the efforts of Hawaii to achieve statehood would not be amiss. In the first place it should be borne in mind that, at the time Hawaii became an organized Territory of the United States, there were several other areas in the same status which have since become States, and it was assumed almost as a matter of course that we would eventually attain the same position. Since annexation Hawaii has grown from a population of 150,000, 60 percent alien, to a population of 500,000, barely 10 percent alien. It is natural that the aspirations of its citizenry for statehood should become stronger in proportion to this growth. Secondly, the more active campaign for statehood commenced in 1933 when a series of measures proposed and executed into law awakened the people of Hawaii to the fact that statehood was not only a natural aspiration but a vital necessity in a republic that has no developed colonial traditions.

In 1933 the so-called Rankin bill was introduced into the Seventy-third Congress. This bill proposed to amend our organic act by removing the moderate residential requirements for Territorial officials. It was an administration measure, sponsored by Mr. Rankin in his capacity as chairman of the House Committee on the Territories.

Despite the fact that the platforms of both national parties had repeatedly pledged their parties to the greatest degree of local self-government for the Territories, the bill passed the House by an overwhelming majority over the strenuous objections of the then delegate, the Honorable L. L. McCandless, Democrat. It was delayed in the United States Senate only through the intercession in behalf of Hawaii of a friendly group of Senators of both parties.

We in Hawaii were greatly alarmed, and considered this legislation a serious attack on our integrity as a Territory, a desertion of the principle of home rule, and a return to the practice of carpet-bag government. In the rush of legislation of national importance and urgent character, the Rankin bill was a minor measure, and all but slipped through. Once enacted into law, and embedded as a part of the Hawaiian Organic Act, it would have taken years and much effort on our part to have it repealed.

Coming on top of the deluge of bills that were introduced into Congress in 1932, proposing legislation that would have all but incorporated the Territory, our weak position as a Territory became all too apparent. To oppose the Rankin bill, then still pend-

ing in the Senate, a bipartisan committee was appointed by the Governor at the time, the Hon. Lawrence M. Judd. From the group a delegation of three—Judge A. G. M. Robertson, Territorial Senator William H. Heen, and myself,—were selected to proceed to Washington. We found the sponsorship of the bill due to complete misunderstanding of the situation in Hawaii, and were able to convince the Administration that the measure was neither necessary nor wise. It was recalled from the Senate calendar early in 1934, and the principle of home rule reaffirmed.

Later, in 1934, the Jones-Costigan Act, setting up sugar quotas, treated Hawaii, as well as Puerto Rico, differently from other American producing areas, an injustice and discrimination which was rectified in part only by the amendments adopted in 1937.

However, it was obvious that both our political and our economic rights as an integral part of the Nation were insecure as long as we remained a territory, that we would continue to be vulnerable to inimical legislation until we achieved statehood. Only last month the Attorney General of the United States contended before the Supreme Court of the United States that the Constitution extended to Hawaii only by the sufferance of Congress.

I was elected to the Seventy-fourth Congress as the Delegate from Hawaii, and served four terms as such. I withdrew from the campaign in 1942 to return to active service in the United States Navy.

During the 8 years I was the Delegate from Hawaii I worked unceasingly for statehood. The campaign has since been carried on most effectively by my distinguished successor, Delegate Farrington, one of the earliest champions for statehood, as was his father, the late Gov. Wallace R. Farrington, before him.

As a result of our efforts a subcommittee of the House Committee on the Territories held hearings here in Hawaii in 1935 on my bill to enable Hawaii to become a State. A joint committee of Congress went even more exhaustively into the subject of statehood for Hawaii in 1937. Less formal investigations by groups of Members of Congress were carried out in 1939. Furthermore, a Territorial plebiscite on statehood was held in 1940. Under most inauspicious circumstances, with war hanging over us, a better than 2-to-1 majority declared for statehood. War intervened to defer further consideration of the matter until now. With the termination of the war Hawaii is again asking for statehood.

The report of the previous hearings are before you. The arguments pro and con are in the record. There is little that can be added to the quite exhaustive data on the subject, except to bring the facts up to date. I understand that this is being done, and that your committee will be furnished the latest statistics on every phase of our community life.

I should like to point out that both the previous formal congressional hearings on the subject deferred but did not deny Hawaii's plea for statehood. The 1935 House subcommittee, in a report that praised Hawaii most highly, divided in its recommendation. Three members recommended further study of the pending enabling act; two desired to report out the bill favorably to the full committee for immediate consideration.

The joint committee of 1937 in a masterly summary of the arguments for and against, included this paragraph:

That the present disturbed condition of international affairs, while not a permanent deterrent to the aspirations of the people of Hawaii, suggests the wisdom of further study and consideration of this question, and possibly the holding of a plebiscite at some future time.

and concludes with the recommendation:

* * * that the question of statehood for Hawaii be deferred, to be further considered by the Congress on some appropriate occasion, after determination of the sentiment of its people and upon further application by them through proper channels.

Other witnesses will present the latest statistics, stressing various numerical achievements which are generally considered to be the prerequisites to statehood.

But beyond and above these figures, of more importance than the statistics that present only the bare outline of our growth, is the spiritual record of Hawaii during the war years, the loyalty and patriotism of its people, the acceptance of war conditions more burdensome and more complete than that experienced by any mainland community.

We endured martial law and military government, neither invoked in any part of the United States, not even in the Philippine Islands.

We were subjected to a censorship of personal mail which greatly increased the difficulties of carrying on legitimate business and further resulted in leaving the mainland in ignorance of our contribution to the national cause.

Our labor accepted what amounted to a "freezing" on the job, a condition never achieved on the mainland.

Our people adjusted themselves to rationing of supplies more severe than that undergone by any comparable community.

Our lands and buildings, public and private, were at the complete disposal of the armed forces of the United States; the schools turned into hospitals, agricultural lands into air fields, office buildings into military offices, homes into recreation centers.

Our scant store of merchandise was commandeered to supplement the scantier supplies of the military forces.

Our men and women in large numbers gave of their time and labor gladly, in both paid and unpaid services; with the Office of Civilian Defense, the Red Cross, the USO, the Gray Ladies, as hostesses and partners at recreation centers; and other activities too numerous to list. Special mention should be made of the prompt response of the medical fraternity to the great need for help after December 7, 1941, and to the overwhelming turn-out in answer to the call for blood donors during those grim days.

These invaluable contributions to the common cause saved our armed forces time, that most precious commodity in war, and very often money, as in many cases services and facilities were donated.

In all this, of course, Hawaii's people were but doing their duty, to an extent greater than comparable communities only because of our geographical location. Until after the Battle of Midway, we were the western frontier of America, the front line of our defense in the Pacific. After that battle was won we became the principal base

for our offense in the Pacific, until the westward advance of our forces relegated us to the position of a rear base.

The point I want to make is that Hawaii did its duty well and willingly, with a maximum of cooperation with the military commanders, and a cheerful acceptance of conditions that were simply beyond the conception of mainland communities.

The performance of its people in all these matters was splendid, a record in which every citizen or resident of this Territory can take pride, a performance of duty that has been highly praised by every responsible military commander on duty here during the war period.

I feel free to speak in high terms of my community's war effort because I personally was not here during this period, except briefly. During 1942 I was in Congress, supplementing the local activities as best I could in representing Hawaii there. For the following 3 years I was on active duty in the Navy, in the Central Pacific, on duty from Samoa to Japan. So I speak in praise of Hawaii's war record more or less objectively, as one who followed it closely, but did not directly share the tough sledding of the war years.

Even exceeding this general community participation in the war effort is our contribution to the fighting forces of the Nation. Our National Guard was called into Federal service on October 15, 1940, organized as the Two hundred and Ninety-eighth and Two Hundred and Ninety-ninth Infantry Regiments. Built up to war strength by the draft, these regiments served with distinction in the South Pacific area.

Approximately 123,000 men registered under the provisions of the Selective Service Act. Of this number 28,256 were called into service, thousands of whom did not wait to be drafted but volunteered. In one specific instance, when the War Department decided to segregate the American citizens of Japanese ancestry into one unit, and asked for 1,500 volunteers from that racial group, a number later increased to 3,000, over 10,000 volunteered.

The heroic record of this latter group, the famous One Hundredth Infantry Battalion and the Four Hundred and Forty-second Combat Battalion has been a matter of national and official recognition. Their exploits in the Italian campaign and their fine military behavior throughout their service in the Army of the United States is a splendid example of American democracy at work. They merit the highest praise, and fulfilled the anticipations of those who maintained that our citizens of Japanese ancestry were loyal to the country of their nativity, and would meet the test when tried. The fact that they did has been given considerable publicity principally because of the doubts expressed by those who did not know this group of young Americans as we in Hawaii knew them.

However, I ask the committee to take cognizance of the fine record of our citizens of other racial ancestry, all answering the call to military service as Americans. Our National Guard, maintained at a high state of efficiency for years before the war, has already been mentioned. Some 1,110 officers and men volunteered for service in the United States Navy, and approximately 5,000 inductees from the Selective Service were assigned to the naval service.

In all, 33,144 of our citizens served their country in uniform, a complete cross-section of our population. Boys of Caucasian background,

including a large number of Portuguese ancestry, of Chinese race, thousands of Filipino nationality, and proportionate numbers of our smaller racial groups, all did their full part in the service of the United States. The Hawaiians and part Hawaiians had always been the backbone of the old National Guard, and supplemented the guardsmen with a large quota of volunteers and draftees. Three general officers, two of them part Hawaiians, and literally thousands of officers of lesser rank have been commissioned from among our citizens, drawn from all our racial groups.

With a civil population of about 400,000 in 1940, our contribution of 33,144 to the armed might of America compares very favorably with that of the Nation as a whole. It should also be noted that the extreme manpower shortage in Hawaii constrained many to continue their civilian occupations, who would have preferred to serve in the armed forces. All these circumstances are evidences of a loyal and patriotic citizenry, individually deeply imbued with a high sense of their obligations as Americans to fight for their country if called upon to do so.

Our veterans are just now coming home, and we feel very proud of them, as every other community undoubtedly does of its veterans. They have earned for us, in the Navy phrase, a "well done, Hawaii."

I bring this record out, knowing that no less is true of America as a whole, simply to fill out the history of the war years, and because the opponents of statehood have heretofore based almost the whole of their opposition on their doubts as to the loyalty of a portion of our citizenry.

Those of us who advocated statehood believed our judgment, expressed in 1935 and 1937, as to the patriotism and loyalty of our people, has been completely justified, that the facts touched upon above prove Hawaii as loyal, as patriotic as any other part of the nation, as willing to accept its share, or a disproportionate share of the common obligations of citizenship. Most of the other phases of our status, political and economic, have been conceded to meet all the requirements of statehood. Doubts as to the degree of Americanization of our people has been the principal if not the sole cause for delay.

Does not the trial by war and the proof in that war dispel those doubts once and for all time?

The eyes of the world are on the United States as never before. We must play a great part in world affairs, whether we will or no. Our moral prestige among the peoples of the world is very high. Our record of the past, our democratic principles, that preaches equal rights to all regardless of race, has become the light of hope to many peoples. What we practice must accord with our principles, or we will lose our high standing before the world by so much as we deviate from that practice. Already an official of a Pacific nation has expressed his deep interest and that of his country, an independent dominion of the British Commonwealth, in our drive for statehood.

Hawaii has an important place in the Pacific world. Because of the very diversity of races that seems to handicap its plea for statehood its progress in democracy is a matter of interest to great and populous nations bordering the Pacific. As we acquire, as possessions or in trust, island groups in the Central Pacific, Hawaii's importance

as the strategic, political, and economic center of our Pacific domain, becomes even greater. America's allegiance to democratic principles will be judged to a considerable extent by what happens to Hawaii.

If the prerequisites for statehood have already been met in all other respects, and if the doubt as to the loyalty of a portion of our population has been allayed by the war, then what remaining condition must we fulfill before we take our rightful place as the Forty-ninth State? Unless there is a definite showing that we lack some necessary requirement for statehood what justification can there be before the bar of public opinion, of the Nation and the world, for denying us this natural, this logical promotion from the transitory status of a Territory to the permanent position of a State, a promotion in the American tradition, following the precedents of American history since the birth of the Nation?

So far no such lack has been established. The onus should be on the opponents of statehood, the burden of proof should lie with them to show good cause why Hawaii should not be a State. Unless that is done to the satisfaction of this committee, I urge the committee to recommend favorably to the full committee a bill to enable Hawaii to become a State.

As you visit the Territory I hope the schedule will give you a chance to do a little of the ordinary sightseeing, that will leave you visual impressions of this community. I hope after you go back you will agree that there is no single factor missing in Hawaii's claims for statehood, and in all requirements and all the phases of community life, that it meets the standard of the United States as a whole.

Chairman LARCADE. Thank you very much. I think you have made a most able and interesting presentation, and we appreciate your reference to the work of the committee, because we know that you appreciate our presence here. Is there any question by any member of the committee?

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I'd like to have Delegate King bring out some information which I believe is pertinent to his testimony. First of all, I'd like you to state for the record something of your ancestral background and your political background, your service as a public official.

Mr. KING. Delegate Farrington puts us on the spot by asking us to give you our personal record ourselves. I'm sorry Judge Robertson didn't do it for me. I am a part-Hawaiian born here in Hawaii. My father was a Scotchman, a naturalized American citizen. My mother was of New England and Hawaiian ancestry. My first Yankee ancestor came here in 1793, nearly 30 years before the American missionaries. One of my small points of pride is that my people came here before the missionaries came to Christianize us. My people have been in public life consistently throughout the history of Hawaii. I was appointed to Annapolis from Hawaii.

Mr. FARRINGTON. In that connection, isn't it true that your father was—

Mr. KING. My grandfather was an associate justice of the Supreme Court of the Kingdom of Hawaii. My father was Minister of Interior of the Republic of Hawaii and one of the charter members of the Annexation Club. I don't think the committee and the community generally realize how active a group of patriotic Americans

lived here prior to annexation, which was determined that this community should come under the American flag, and I don't think the people of the United States realize the debt they owe that group. It would have handicapped America very greatly if annexation had not happened. I can't conceive of any other nation controlling these islands, except to the detriment of the United States. My father, and those associated with him, fought from 1893 to 1898 to consummate annexation. I was appointed to Annapolis by Prince Jonah Kuhio Kalaniana'ole, our Delegate for 10 terms. I was in the Navy from 1905 until 1925, not quite 20 years. I resigned to return to Hawaii to live, and went into business, and somewhat inadvertently got dragged into politics, served on the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of Honolulu for 3 years and in Congress 8 years, and withdrew from the 1942 campaign to go back to active service in the Navy. Delegate Farrington picked up the flag and carried on. I reported back to the Navy on January 4, 1943, the day after my last term in Congress expired. I came home in November 1945, from Japan, where my last tour of duty was as port director of the port of Wakayama, the port of disembarkation of our forces of occupation at Kobe, Osaka, and Kyoto.

MR. FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, in Mr. King's testimony he developed the point that to grant Hawaii statehood would strengthen the position of our country in the Pacific. I would like him to amplify that by telling something of his study of the Pacific islands that preceded his service in the war, and also as a member of Congress, and ask him to develop that thought more thoroughly. It seems to me it is particularly pertinent to the question frequently raised, "Well, what is to be gained by the country, by making Hawaii a State?"

MR. KING. The continued denial of statehood for Hawaii would undoubtedly be a matter of criticism by the public opinion of the world. How important that is, I don't know. In other words, if our policy, our national policy, toward Hawaii and toward the Philippines were not in accord with our high principles in the United Nations of the world, our prestige will be decreased by just so much. Of course, I don't know if you gentlemen feel that that is a very important argument. I wouldn't want to overemphasize it. As I pointed out already a spokesman of one of the dominions of the British Commonwealth said that he and his countrymen were watching the course of Hawaii's appeal for statehood very closely, and were keenly interested. On the other hand, I would say that in our dealings with the great populations that border the Pacific—China, Indonesia, India—the attitude we took toward racial groups of non-Caucasian stock would be very important. On the other hand there are the apprehensions of those who very sincerely feel we have too large a population of one group—the Japanese group. I have never agreed with them. Of course, as you go into public life your motives are sometimes impugned. I have been charged with espousing statehood as a political venture. Frankly, that isn't true. I am a very loyal American and Hawaiian. My first loyalty is to the Nation, and the second to the community in which I was born and raised.

If I believed that the apprehensions of those who suspect the Japanese were justified, I certainly wouldn't come here and ask you to support statehood. I believe that the American democratic way

of life can assimilate and amalgamate these people, the Japanese racial group, as it has every other racial group. They are a little more recent in their arrival here. Some of their background is a little harder to overcome. But the war has proven that American democracy does work. These boys that went to war, they talked Hawaiian pidgin English. They played the ukulele and danced the hula. They are Hawaiian. The Hawaiian influence is very strong with all our people. When I say Hawaiian that isn't anything in opposition to America. When a man says he is a Texan or Louisianian he speaks of his local loyalty, subordinate to the national patriotism. The overemphasis of their war record to the exclusion of our youth of other races is in some aspects a misfortune. Perhaps they should have been amalgamated into the Army as a whole. They asked for it. They were drafted in the beginning, and just amalgamated into the Two Hundred and Ninety-eighth and Two Hundred and Ninety-ninth Regiments. The decision to segregate them wasn't theirs; it was the War Department's.

As I have gone through the Pacific and had duty in Samoa and Eniwetok and Saipan, I have met boys of every ancestry as privates and as officers—Dr. Chun Hoon, a major in the Army Medical Corps in Saipan, whose brother is a commander in the Navy, of Chinese-Hawaiian ancestry; an engineer captain in Saipan who helped build my harbor for me, a part-Hawaiian whose family lives on Maui, whom I know well. There is no justification for any apprehension on the score of loyalty or Americanization of our population in my belief, and I submit the war record of our citizenry has proven their patriotism. The alien Japanese subscribed to every restriction placed on them by the War Department. Such restrictions that were considered necessary were complied with fully and completely and wholeheartedly. General Emmons has certified to that in a public statement. Everything I have said here can be substantiated by generals and naval officers on duty here during the war years.

As to the smaller islands in the Pacific, their economy is almost nil. The population is small. They are an economic liability to the United States. But if we decide to maintain them, somebody has to provide them with agriculture, education, health, and the logical source from which that comes is this Territory.

Mr. FARRINGTON. I'd like to develop further the attitude of the people of Samoa, and what influence our situation may have on them. Isn't it true that the Samoans of western Samoa have frequently expressed a desire to be under the American flag?

Mr. KING. I served 10 months in Samoa on the staff of the major general commanding the Samoan defense area, comprising a chunk of the Pacific Ocean, including both American and western Samoa, Wallis Island, Funafuti, and the Ellice Islands. The high chief of western Samoa, which is under a New Zealand mandate, flew an American flag before his residence in Apia, and had a small American flag flying on his car. He said he was tired of being a ward of some other nation, that he wanted to join the Samoans of American Samoa and become a part of the United States of America.

Mr. FARRINGTON. You served in Eniwetok and had an opportunity to observe the Marshallese. Isn't it true that the native people of the Marshall Islands have petitioned for admission to this country, and

that has stemmed from the treatment that has been accorded the people of these islands?

Mr. KING. Absolutely true. In the old days, Mr. Chairman, if I may run on another 3 minutes, this country was the religious and cultural center of the North Pacific. American missionaries went from here to the Marshalls, the Gilberts, and the Carolines, but not to Samoa. That period ended and another period came in. May I say that we did a great injustice to the Chamorros and Samoans in 1898 and 1900. We took what we wanted of Samoa and said we weren't interested in the rest, and the Germans took the remainder. The British captured German Samoa in 1914. The New Zealanders and Australians had a race up there against the Japanese; fortunately the British got there first. We took Guam and said we weren't interested in the rest of the Mariannas. We took what we wanted and left the rest to fend for themselves.

In 1898 it is as if we had said we needed only Honolulu and Oahu, but we were not interested in Hawaii, or Kauai and Maui. We would have had Japanese sovereignty over part of the Hawaiian group and American sovereignty in Honolulu and Oahu, because Japan was at that time looking toward Hawaii. That's water over the dam. All the Mariannas are under the American flag. As for Samoa, the press states New Zealand has expressed its willingness to surrender her wardship of British Samoa to the United States, so we can reunite the group. Those problems are somewhat extraneous, but are pertinent to this extent, that this community here is Pacific island minded, by our geography and our historical background. We, as a community, could be the agents of the Nation in handling these islands from a cultural, economic, and educational point of view. Politically, I don't know what might be done, military government or naval government—that's for Congress to decide on the advice of the Federal department heads. But so far as Hawaii is concerned, if we were elected a State we'd come into the Union with no adjustments necessary—all in one election. We'd elect a Governor and two Senators and a Representative at the next general election and we'd be ready in 1946. If it took a little longer for the necessary legislation, we certainly could be ready in 1948. After annexation the President of the Republic of Hawaii, Sanford B. Dole, the son of the Rev. Daniel Dole, an American missionary from Massachusetts, was made the first Governor. Later he was the United States district judge for the district of Hawaii. In other words, he was already an American. The entire staff of the Republic of Hawaii were sworn in as the employees of the Territory. There was no need for a new administrative staff.

The basis of our law is the common law—our schools were taught in the English language before annexation. We had universal compulsory public education in 1840. Our law makes Hawaiian and English both legal languages. The legislature hasn't used an Hawaiian interpreter for 30 years. We don't need a Hawaiian interpreter in the courts. In other words, the Hawaiian people were Americanized before we were annexed. It is true the Hawaiians did not all like annexation, but they have since subscribed to their American citizenship with great pride.

I'd like to leave one fact in your mind. Since 1900 the Hawaiian people—when I say Hawaiian, I mean those of full blood or part blood.

The Hawaiians have out-married so fast that there aren't very many full-blooded Hawaiians—1900 was the low-water mark in the total of Hawaiian blood. In 1900 there were 38,254 Hawaiian and part-Hawaiians in this community. At that time there were approximately 154,000 people. In 1945 there were 72,410 Hawaiians and part-Hawaiians in this community. The amount of Hawaiian blood is immaterial. All those with a trace of Hawaiian consider themselves Hawaiian. Ask any boy of Hawaiian blood what he is. He will answer he is a Hawaiian. I am a Hawaiian. I am seven-eighths non-Hawaiian, but after all, my people have lived here for five generations, and on the Hawaiian side for more or less 200 years. I am not a Scotchman, and I am not a New Englander. We are welding together the people of this territory into what we call the neo-Hawaiian. The professor who will follow me, Dr. Lind, and others, will show you the picture of how fast we are amalgamating, because of our racial tolerance and the old Hawaiian spirit of friendliness, which was buttressed by the Christian principles of the New England missionaries that settled here. No one cares whom you marry. I have any number of friends whose wives are of Asiatic origin or oriental ancestry. They are mighty splendid wives, and are welcomed by their families.

MR. FARRINGTON. There is one point I'd like Mr. King to discuss, and that is the bearing that this issue has on the question of national defense. The point is frequently raised that the present form of government should be perpetuated or the Federal Government should be given an even greater measure of control in these islands because of their importance in the scheme of national defense. Will you tell the committee your point of view on that question, if, in your opinion, the granting of a larger measure of local government, local self-government, will strengthen our value from the defense standpoint?

MR. KING. I certainly agree with Delegate Farrington that statehood would strengthen rather than weaken the national defense, for this simple reason, that it binds us more closely into the whole national scene.

I am a Republican, not a very partisan one. Because we have no electoral vote, our local Republican majority maintains itself despite mainland trends.

We had a Democratic landslide here, as on the mainland in 1912, and again in 1932, and the local Democrats gained about one-third of the elective offices. But if we were tied into the national scene the results might well be different. The Democratic Party in Hawaii is a great deal stronger now than it has been in the past. Speaking from a nonpartisan point of view, it would be a fine thing for this community to be tied up with the national political scene, and to have its full part in national politics. That would make us better Americans, if anything, in Hawaii. Also, as a State its representation would always be military-minded. Our congressional delegation would always support a large navy, a big army. We would be assets to the armed forces in that respect, as are the congressional delegations from every State of the seacoast. You can always get strong help from the seaboard States. The difficulty has been to sell the idea of military forces to States in the interior.

Now, as to any interference with military requirements, I could not conceive of it being possible. California is a great sovereign

State, and there were certain conditions there that concerned the Nation as a whole. By Presidential Executive order the commanding general of that area was given very wide powers that he exercised without conflicting with the sovereignty of California, or of any county, or city of California, and the same would be true of Hawaii.

(Mr. Miller and Mr. Angell interjected here.)

Mr. KING. The same thing in Oregon, we were in a tough spot. We were American citizens before we were a member of the statehood party.

Delegate FARRINGTON. Isn't it true that the response of the people of Hawaii to the emergency of war, that you referred to in the early part of your statement, resulted in no small measure from the policy which entrusted them with an extraordinary measure of local responsibility as American citizens?

Mr. KING. Of course, Mr. Chairman, that is true. You cannot get loyal support if you persecute, doubt, misdoubt, and mistrust. You get what you give. If you say, "I respect you as an American; I expect you to act as an American," that brings out the best in a man. When you say, "Well, I don't like you; I don't think you are any good; I mistrust you," what reply are you going to get? One of the most unfortunate things that could happen to Hawaii would be the introduction of racial suspicions, racial doubts. We have lived here as a community of a great many races, but not any more different people than you have on the mainland. The misfortune has been perhaps too large a proportion of one racial group in a small community.

No one has any doubt as to the people of Chinese ancestry; no one has a doubt of the people of Philippine ancestry. It is all centered on the Japanese, partly because of their numerical size, partly because of the war with Japan. I would like to give you one figure on that. In 1945 the Caucasian group in the Territory of Hawaii became the majority group. It has always been true that the Caucasian group, because of leadership and training, has dominated; and their American ideas and institutions have laid the pattern of our culture. This group now is 35.6 percent of the total. The Japanese racial group is the next biggest, 32.8 percent. But the Japanese group has gone down from 42.7 to 32.8 in something like 20 years. It is certain that the proportion will decrease steadily to about 25 percent of our total population, according to the experts who prognosticated this in 1935. Their estimates have proven to be correct within a very small margin of error.

Our system of recording nationality with the board of health is really arbitrary and has led to much confusion. A child of mixed ancestry is listed as of the race of the mother. We keep tagging them with their racial background indefinitely. Native-born children of native-born parents, in other words, the second generation native-born, are still called Japanese, or Chinese, and so forth. I don't know how long we are going to continue to tag them with a racial background. The Federal census would call them native-born children of native-born parents, and they would lose, as they should, a racial label that has ceased to have any meaning. Included in those listed as Japanese are a large number of mixed ancestry, and thousands of children of the second generation native-born.

Delegate FARRINGTON. I don't want to monopolize the proceedings in order to extend this, but I do want Mr. King, before he leaves, to tell the committee some of the disadvantages that come from serving and representing Hawaii in Congress without a vote. He served there 8 years. I think he can point out in a few words where our position would be enormously strengthened if we were given voting representation in both Houses.

Mr. KING. May I say that I have watched my time. I finished at 12 o'clock. Since then I have continued at the pleasure of the committee.

Chairman LARCADE. I think you have made a most valuable contribution.

Mr. KING. I will say in answer to Delegate Farrington that in the Navy there is a rank of chief warrant officer. He is promoted from the ranks, and becomes a warrant officer, then a chief or commissioned warrant officer. As chief warrant officer he wears a gold stripe with a break of green braid. He is, therefore, sometimes called a "broken striper." He never gets beyond that in rank, though he does in pay. Every graduate from Annapolis outranks him. In Congress I was chief warrant officer in comparison to you gentlemen who are Representatives. I remember when I was serving a fourth term, I had no seniority except as to quarters. Those who came in with me had already begun to be chairmen of subcommittees, and were taking an increasingly important part in national affairs. A Delegate is restricted by the very terms of his position in Congress to expressing himself only on matters pertinent to his district. He cannot take part in national affairs, even though he might have some very burning thoughts he would like to get off his mind on veterans' legislation or a big navy, or anything else. The lack of representation in the Senate is really tragic. Now, I can realize that with a great State like New York, with 12,000,000 people, it gets a little—

Representative DELANEY. Fifteen million.

Representative MILLER. He just passed through California.

Mr. KING. Resentful of the small States, such as Hawaii would be, having two Senators, when that is all it has. Unfortunately that is the basis of the Federal Union. I would have no objection if the Constitution provided a larger number of Senators for the more populous States. But our Constitution provided otherwise. Delaware with 250,000 people has two Senators. Hawaii with 500,000 would have two Senators. I have stood on the floor of the Senate, as along with other Members of the House I had the privilege of going, and just itched to get up and put in a word for Hawaii when I saw legislation just going on the rocks that was absolutely vital to us. I remember on one occasion when the amendments to the so-called Sugar Act were under consideration. Whether we are right or wrong, we produce sugar by large corporations; it is an industrialized farm. An amendment was proposed from the floor of the Senate to limit compliance payments under the act to \$10,000. This would have bankrupted our sugar industry. Beet-sugar farmers rarely raised enough beets per farm to qualify for large payments, as our plantations do. It was proposed, as you know, from the floor, and there was no one to speak for Hawaii. The proposal would have wrecked our industry and the sugar industry of Puerto Rico. There was no

one there to defend us, as spokesmen for Hawaii. The amendment was lost only on a parliamentary ground, and not on its merits.

I have said this before, maybe there is no occasion to say it now, but as a matter of fact I haven't got a dollar in the sugar industry—and I don't receive any rentals or other income from the sugar industry. But it is about approximately 60 percent of the economic life of this Territory, and anything detrimental to it, as unjust, or discriminatory, certainly must be opposed by whoever represents this Territory, regardless of what party he is elected from, or what particular class was most active in his support. Does that answer the question?

Delegate FARRINGTON. One more question, and this point should be made, and I will cease firing, so to speak. That is, unless specifically provided, territories are not included in national legislation?

Mr. KING. That is true.

Delegate FARRINGTON. And repeatedly legislation is presented for the States that is not extended to the Territories unless special representations are made, and the bill so provides? And in the case of applicants for appointment to the Naval and Military Academy, every State has a minimum of, I think, 12 to West Point, and 15 to Annapolis, whereas Hawaii has one-third of that number. Can you add to that?

Mr. KING. That is absolutely true. Mr. Farrington, the Delegate from Hawaii has the same quota as other individual Congressmen to Annapolis and West Point. It is not, as you know, an appointment every year, but it is a quota to be kept filled, five to Annapolis and four at West Point. A State such as Nevada with 100,000 population, with two Senators and one Representative, has three times our quota, with 500,000 population.

During the time I was Delegate I had over 200 boys' names on my list, and I was really very sorry I could not appoint them. I just didn't have the appointments.

We are service-minded. We are a service-minded community. Lots of our boys would like to enter the service schools, to serve in the Army or Navy, and they are penalized by living in a Territory. That is not a great point, but it is mighty important to the individual.

As to this other matter that Delegate Farrington spoke of, that is that major legislation passed by Congress frequently leaves us out, I can speak for the period from 1933 to 1942. During the time I was there, and the 2 years before I was there, we were invariably left out of the first draft of every important bill. It is done mostly inadvertently. A Delegate has to be unceasingly on the job, and has got to spot those bills, read them, and take them up with the committee. The first draft of the National Security Act left us out. The wages-and-hours bill left us out, the Fair Labor Standards Act, and I said "We want it, too," and was told the sponsors had thought Hawaii would not desire to be included. I replied "Of course we do. Our working people expect to get the same working conditions as they have on the mainland," so it was amended to include us. That has been my concern, during my term as Delegate. Even the War Damage Corporation, the war insurance legislation left us out. I had to appear before the Senate committee and protest vigorously, and then before the House committee—I think it was the House Committee on Banking—and battle to be included.

Hawaii had relatively minimum war damage. The Philippines are going to receive several hundred million dollars war damage in insurance payments. In other words, when the language was changed to include Hawaii, it was phrased so as to make it all-inclusive, to cover every place where the American flag flies. Even Samoa benefits. The Japanese dropped a shell in Samoa and damaged a store. Guam will be able to collect substantial sums.

Chairman LARCADE. Any other questions, gentlemen?

Representative ANGELL. Will the witness return this afternoon?

Chairman LARCADE. What is the pleasure of the committee? Shall we recess now, or continue with Mr. King, or do you desire to continue for a specified time? The committee is ahead of its schedule. We will have ample time to recess until 2:30. Is there any more testimony that you think that you require from Mr. King?

Delegate FARRINGTON. Well, I have asked all the questions I want to submit.

Chairman LARCADE. How long will you be?

Representative ANGELL. Just several minutes.

Chairman LARCADE. I would suggest that the committee conclude their interrogation of Mr. King, and then we recess until 2:30, if that is agreeable.

Delegate FARRINGTON. I would suggest 2 o'clock, instead of 2:30.

Representative DELANEY. No objection.

Representative ANGELL. I would like to ask a few questions of Captain King. First, permit me to say, Mr. Chairman, that I have had the good fortune to serve in Congress with former Delegate Captain King for several years, and also with his successor, Delegate Farrington. I think I can say, without fear of contradiction from anyone in Congress, that the Territory has been very, very fortunate indeed in having men of such high caliber as these two men. They have endeared themselves to the Members of our Congress. They have always been alert to their obligations and duties and they have been on the job continuously fighting for the Territory, as Captain King has just said.

It has come to my attention a number of times as a member of the Territorial Committee that had it not been for the Delegates, Tony Diamond, of Alaska, and Sam King, of Hawaii, during their tenure, and now Bob Bartlett and Joseph Farrington, the Territories would have suffered materially. They have done a grand job.

Now, captain, I would like to ask you one or two questions. Perhaps you may not have the answers: Are there any foreign-language publications in the Territory?

Mr. KING. Up to the war there were a number, a large number of Japanese language newspapers, and a very few, three or four Chinese language newspapers, one or two Korean, and many Filipino.

Representative ANGELL. Were they out of proportion to the population, as compared with the mainland, where we have many foreign-language publications, particularly before the war?

Mr. KING. I would say not, if you take into account the time element as to when that immigrant group arrived. There was a period when there were German language papers throughout the country, the *Stats-Zeitung*, for instance, was a great paper in America, published in New York for many years. Our immigrant groups being more recent, their foreign-language papers were rather numerous.

I would like to point out that conditions with the leading foreign-language papers were changing very rapidly. The Hawaii Hochi, and the Nippu Jiji used to be all Japanese. Then it became bilingual, and more and more English, until the English part become more important than the Japanese part.

The Japanese part gave a condensation of the news for the older group. The English part gave UP, AP, and INS services, business dispatches, American comics, and syndicated articles. Frankly, I will agree, if anyone wants to ask me on that point, that there were too many of them, and that some of them were getting Domei press news that were a little bit of propaganda.

We were unable locally to control such papers. You could not blame Hawaii for that. There is a constitutional provision that protects them in that. That was a problem that the National Government had to solve, whether they could print such news or print in foreign languages. That comes under the general—what do you call it—Bill of Rights of the Constitution.

In some respects the same applies to the Japanese language schools. There was quite a large number of them. The enrollment was bigger than it should have been. There was a small enrollment in Chinese language schools, and in one or two Korean schools. That became a point for those who opposed statehood, on the ground that the Japanese language schools did not show a rapid decrease, as had been experienced on the mainland. But since the war that has been one of the things that has been cleared up by the war. The Japanese language schools are no longer in existence. They are now turning their properties over to a trust fund for the benefit of veterans.

Representative ANGELL. That was the next question I proposed to ask you, with reference to language schools. Are there some now that continue to exist?

Mr. KING. None that I know of, Mr. Angell. I wouldn't say positively that there are none. There were none during the war; whether any started up since, I don't know.

Representative ANGELL. Are there any statistics that would show how education in the Territory compares with that on the mainland? I know Governor Stainback covered it and spoke of the very excellent school system that you had. I wondered how it compared with the mainland.

Mr. KING. We locally have a criticism against the type of language used by our students. We call it "pidgin English." I have never felt it was a very serious detriment, in that every locality has its little provincialisms and idioms that are different from the other localities. The gentleman from New York has a different enunciation of certain words. It might be true locally in Louisiana. But other than that the school system of Hawaii is very high.

We started compulsory general education in 1840, almost at the same time it was initiated in the United States by Dr. Horace Mann in Massachusetts. We increased the age limit, the school-age limit, from 14 to 16, some time in the early 1930's, so that every boy and girl must attend a public school in the English language or a private school, whose standards are satisfactory to the department of public instruction. We have three private schools of very high standard, endowed schools—Kamehameha, St. Louis School, and Punahou School—besides others throughout the Territory. Then, if the par-

ents wish, we cannot stop children from going to a foreign-language school, outside of the regular school hours. The Japanese language schools never did take the place of our public instruction, or our private schools in English. The foreign-language schools were limited to a certain number of hours a day, and a certain number of days a week. Here again it is a national problem, not under Hawaii's control.

Hawaii passed a law in 1921, when Delegate Farrington's father, I believe, was Governor, to control the foreign-language schools. Some of the schools, not all of them, joined together to oppose the law, and it was held, under a decision of the Supreme Court in similar cases, when they tried to ban the German schools in Oregon and Nebraska, that the Constitution barred any such legislation. They did come more or less under the jurisdiction and supervision of the department of public instruction, and when the war came they were simply abolished by military order.

Representative ANGELL. Is the English language generally used by the young people in the islands?

Mr. KING. Almost invariably. The great majority of the youth of Hawaii do not know the languages of their parents and grandparents. If they do know it, they know it badly. I would say further that all of their heroes are Americans. The average boy and girl of whatever race knows all about the baseball heroes and football heroes, the sports scores, and the moving-picture heroes and heroines. They have no cultural contact with any country but the United States.

Representative ANGELL. They even know about Shirley Temple and Mae West?

Mr. KING. Mae West is my generation, but they know all about Shirley Temple. Shirley Temple came here and gave a public reception in this building, and the grounds were literally crowded with children who wanted to see her.

Representative ANGELL. Do you have any statistics of the young men who were called to service and what percentage was rejected for educational deficiencies as compared with those on the mainland?

Mr. KING. No, sir.

Representative ANGELL. Are they available?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I will ask if the Hawaii Equal Rights Commission can supply that.

Representative ANGELL. I will ask if they can be supplied for the record.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I think we can get that for you.

Representative ANGELL. I think that is all.

Chairman LARCADE. Any other questions? Thank you very much, Mr. King. As I said a few minutes ago, I think you have made a most valuable contribution to the hearing of this committee. I appreciate your appearance very much.

Mr. KING. Thank you.

(Mr. King was excused and withdrew.)

Chairman LARCADE. Gentlemen, the committee, if it is agreeable, will recess until 2 o'clock.

(A recess was taken at this time until 2 p. m., January 7, 1946.)

AFTERNOON SESSION

Delegate FARRINGTON. Let's go, Mr. Chairman. We do not need to wait too long.

Chairman LARCADE. Are you ready with the witness?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes.

Chairman LARCADE. Let us proceed. The committee will come to order. At this time, if you will pardon me a minute, the committee will recognize Mr. Silverman, general counsel, who is connected with the Department of the Interior, if he desires to address the committee at this time.

Mr. SILVERMAN. Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, I should like to have the opportunity of submitting for the record at this time the statement of the Secretary of the Interior, Harold L. Ickes, issued by him on December 20, in favor of statehood. Mr. Chairman, I should like to have this statement appear, if you will, following the remarks of the chairman in opening the meeting this morning.

Chairman LARCADE. Is there any objection from the committee? Hearing none, it will be so ordered. You may file the statement, Mr. Silverman.

Representative TAYLOR. Also the Governor's statement.

Chairman LARCADE. Yes; and also the statement of the Governor.

Mr. SILVERMAN. Yes. May I also submit that?

Chairman LARCADE. You had better include that in your records.

The Chair will now recognize Judge Robertson.

Mr. ROBERTSON. We now present Mr. E. E. Black, director of the Office of Civilian Defense of the Territory.

Mr. E. E. BLACK. I have had a statement prepared of the civilian defense activity in Hawaii prior to and during the war with Japan. I have been Territorial director of civilian defense since November 1, 1942, so that the preliminary was done before. I have prepared a history of that for your records. I would like to make some comments on it.

Chairman LARCADE. Fine. We would be glad to hear from you, Mr. Black, if you will be seated.

Mr. BLACK. The civilian authorities of Hawaii were warned by the Army and the Navy to be prepared to take care of themselves as early as 1939, and active steps were taken along this line in 1940.

In 1940 there were 1,500 provisional police trained, and they were ready to function in April, 1941. There was a major disaster council created in April 1941 by the mayor and board of supervisors of the City and County and Honolulu, for the purpose of coordinating all the civilian resources of the island of Oahu. The mayor and board appropriated \$5,000 to finance this venture, and \$1,700 was donated by firms and individuals. Similar councils were set up on the islands of Kauai, Maui, Molokai, and Hawaii, following the example of Oahu.

Chairman LARCADE. Pardon me, sir, is your statement prepared?

Mr. BLACK. Well, I was just giving the high lights. I will give you the whole statement, if you like.

Chairman LARCADE. No. I was just trying to save the reporter from taking it down if you were going to read it verbatim.

Mr. BLACK. I wasn't going to, because it is about twenty-one pages.

Chairman LARCADE. Go right ahead, sir, as you desire.

Mr. BLACK. All right. The mayor and the board of supervisors also financed an appropriation of \$6,000 and the proceeds of a benefit game for the expenses of an emergency medical ambulance committee. They further appropriated \$16,000 and another fund of \$10,000 for medical supplies and first-aid equipment in 1941. These medical supplies had arrived previous to December 7, and had been established in first-aid stations that had been set up, and they were ready to function. The medical preparedness went back into 1940, when the training of first-aid people was instigated.

As of November 30, 1941, there were 220 ambulances, that were vehicles suitable for that purpose that had been designated to be used in case of emergency. Five thousand and one hundred volunteers were trained in first-aid work. The emergency medical service functioned efficiently following the attack on the morning of the 7th of December, and remained on duty almost constantly for the next 4 days.

There was a blood-plasma bank established in early 1941. It was sponsored by a \$3,500 donation by the chamber of commerce. It had 250 ccs. of blood plasma available as of September 1941 and did yeoman service on the 7th.

There was an evacuation committee that was set up that had taken an inventory of safe places to evacuate people, and provide for lodgings and feeding. These also functioned. After the attack there were 3,000 people who had to be moved, and they were lined up so that it was done in a systematic way.

There were fire wardens established. There were 500 that were trained before the 7th, and on the night of the 7th every block in this town was patrolled.

There were many other committees established to take care of public utilities, and functions of the city and county, and most of them had not functioned, only in planning and preparing before the attack.

In October 1941 there was a special session of the legislature and the M-day bill was passed. Funds were made available for emergency. There was a special allotment of \$580,000 for immediate use, and \$1,000,000 for emergency if it occurred.

The Governor established the Office of Civilian Defense after December 7, and used this Major Disaster Council organization as a foundation for its future work. On January 12, 1942, the President of the United States made \$15,000,000 available, and after that time, after February 1, the OCD was financed by Federal funds.

As of June 1942 the organization was comprised of 2,500 paid employees and 16,000 volunteers. The files of the volunteer replacement bureau had 40,000 volunteers that were available if it was necessary.

Chairman LARCADE. What was the nature of the work that was performed by its paid volunteers?

Mr. BLACK. The paid volunteers?

Chairman LARCADE. Those paid?

Mr. BLACK. Well, there was office work, heads of various functions that we had. I have a list of them here if you want to go into detail.

Chairman LARCADE. No. Just generally.

Mr. BLACK. There was division of streets; there was civilian defense that had big reconnaissance plans and training; demolition, rescue, repair, gas defense functions, communication, transportation, mortuary, burials, women's division, and then rural Oahu. Then we had the same set up on each of the outside islands. It was headed up from this office here in Honolulu, but the same, in a smaller degree, dependent upon the number of people involved, existed on the outside islands.

Chairman LARCADE. The reason why I asked this question, in some instances all the services were more or less voluntary in other parts of the country.

Mr. BLACK. That's quite right, but you see we had been actually attacked. There was a possibility of further attack. There was 24-hour duty. People were willing to do everything that they could, but to man it continuously, you could not get enough people to do that, without paying something.

Chairman LARCADE. I see.

Mr. BLACK. Like in our raid wardens, we had 6,000 trained volunteers. For instance, before the battle of Midway, the water front was evacuated, and that fell upon the wardens of the OCD to handle it, and they handled it smoothly.

We had an emergency feeding service that was established. There was one cafeteria right here. Another one we had at the Kaahumanu School that has been recently shut down. They were set up and functioning as going concerns to take care of any feeding emergency we might have. They were handled by the territorial fund and were self-supporting, so that there was no government fund expended upon them at all.

We had to increase the hospital capacity of the islands. We set up a running 500-bed hospital at Sacred Hearts, a Catholic school. We set up a running hospital at Wahiawa, with some 250 beds. We established a stand-by hospital at the Shriners that could handle around 200, and had served as a hospital for the polio epidemic we had in 1943. We had another stand-by hospital up in Manoa that had some 200 beds. That is where part of the paid employees came in. When you actually run a hospital, you have to have trained personnel that must be paid.

The blood bank was taken over by the OCD and was carried by it up to several months ago. It has been standing on its own two feet, functioning, and carrying on the work that it is called upon to do now.

We registered all the available nurses in the islands. We recruited several hundred from the mainland with the help of the Red Cross. There were transportation arrangements and that sort of thing to bring them in. They had to be paid when they came.

We had emergency food storage, the storing of staple foods in safe places that would serve as a basis of feeding the people that might have to be evacuated to the hills in case of any attack on our water front, or in the congested areas down around the water front.

Chairman LARCADE. Of the large group that comprised that 16,000 volunteers, I presume that was made up generally of citizens, generally representing all groups?

Mr. BLACK. All groups, from the highest executive to the plantation laborer; all of them. They all responded to that work for what they could do.

Chairman LARCADE. There was no restriction——

Mr. BLACK. None whatsoever.

Chairman LARCADE. As to any special race?

Mr. BLACK. There was some selection in some of the functions that coordinated closely with the Army, in bomb reconnaissance, and that sort of thing, where they insisted on the examination on certain qualifications as control, however.

Chairman LARCADE. But in general, the program was participated in by all the citizens?

Mr. BLACK. The whole community on all the islands.

We had a registration bureau that was set up in July 1941. After December 1941 we started to register all the residents of the islands. On June 30, 1944, we had the personal history of 500,000 people and had 450,000 fingerprints. I am told by people who should know that it is the outstanding fingerprinting job of any place in the United States, because practically everyone had to have identification. Of course, practically everybody did have to have an identification card. The same thing, of course, was carried on on the outside islands. We had protective construction, where we had to splinterproof all our utilities. We had to, and we did build splinterproof shelters for 40,000 people in this town. They have since been removed. That was done by contract, in some cases, but we did have to have a department that installed stand-by electric plants, the taking care of buildings and repair of them, and adapting school buildings to first-aid stations, and various things that we had to do.

My tenure of office started November 1, 1942, when this was all set up and going in a big way, and the battle of Midway had been won, and it fell to my lot to start cutting it off.

We did a great deal of coordinating, and combining, too. A certain amount of complacency set in with some of our volunteers, that we were trying to replace paid employees with that duty. We received 100 percent cooperation from the Army and Navy, on pictures, particularly, that they let us have. We saw the fight on Leyte before it was released, things like that, that helped that side of our endeavor.

Chairman LARCADE. Who was your predecessor, sir, was he a local citizen?

Mr. BLACK. Yes, Mr. Locey.

There is a great deal in here [referring to statement] if you are interested in reading it; it is not necessary to bring that out. In the matter of gas defense, there was quite a job in itself. There were 400,000 regular United States training masks given to this community; there were built-up masks for those whose faces were too small for them. There were 35,000 bunny masks for infants. Those were developed here, so that we could take care of all the people. That was the greatest fear that we had of a gas attack for quite some time.

The bomb reconnaissance division was working very closely with the Army. They were hand-picked people who had to be trained to locate and identify the various kinds of bombs. The Army themselves took care of the disposition of the high explosives. Our people located them and tried to tag them as to the kind of bomb that they were.

We had 100-percent response from the Boy Scouts. They came into our outfit to work as our messengers, and that type of work. They worked right straight through along with their leader. We had a

women's division, whose duty it was to form neighborhood groups, to educate the women and children of families so that they might take care of themselves in case of any gas attack, or in an incendiary raid, and that sort of thing, making them as self-sufficient as possible. They did an outstanding job. The personnel was taken over a year ago by the social welfare, and carried on their roster.

After the restoration of civil rights we had some functions that we had to pick up that were carried on by the military. There was the division of material and supplies, where every piece of equipment had to have a permit, and space had to be allotted to it to come into the Territory. That required quite a lot of work coordinating. An office was established in San Francisco to handle it from that end, and the materials and supplies were sorted out to fit the space we had available according to their necessity. And that was it; it was very trying at the time.

We had an office of food production. The primary object was to increase the local production of food. They did an excellent job, and did increase it materially. They also took care of the poultry and the feed that was necessary. Also for dairies, dairy cattle, and the feed that was necessary for them, so that we could coordinate that with the necessary space to get the absolute necessity for feed of that kind. They also increased the amount of swine on the islands by using swill from the Army and Navy. During 1943 there was over 6,000,000 pounds of pork produced on this island from that source. We were able to bring in feeders from the mainland and help out, and breeding stock as well. They had to bring in seed. We actually ran two farms that the Army had been running before. We took those over, so that we would not decrease the amount of fresh vegetables. And many millions of pounds of green vegetables were produced by school children, with the help of a few men from each of the plantations in that district, working with them.

We had a food control division that worked with the importers to this Territory, who were best qualified to decide what was necessary to bring in, and agreed on the quantity of material and the food, in coordination with the FECC, so that we were able to have a very good diet during the war. This food control division also took over the materials and supplies, as we cut down and consolidated. They had to use very sound judgment, and at times it was very trying, when you stop and think that this community needs 35,000 tons of food, and about 50,000 tons of supplies to get by. There were many months when we had less than 30,000 tons of shipping. There had to be some very sound thinking and good maneuvering to get us through. There were times when there were just the bare necessities of food and medical supplies, but that's all we could do.

We had to have a medical supply and poison control that we inherited from the military control that controlled poisons. You had to get a permit to buy even household poisons. It had to be controlled that closely, we thought, for the security of the islands.

There was one group that must be given a great deal of credit here, in our judgment, and that is the emergency police reserve, organized early in July 1941, under the Honolulu Police Department. The original force was commissioned December 1, 1941. It was comprised of about 150 businessmen from 30 to 45 years of age. They were

increased to about 300 men during the war. These men, in pairs, took beats and covered them. The police department would never have been able to carry the load without them. They were given \$10 a month to pay for public liability on their own personal cars that they used in this work.

Our fire department, of course, was expanded, and additional fire equipment was made available. Additional firemen were paid from OCD funds. We had 50 trailer pumpers that were placed in strategic places all over the island and on the outside islands, manned by volunteers only. Trucks to handle these were furnished by the commanding general. They were ton and a half Dodge army trucks. They did a splendid job. Of course, we had competitions, interisland competitions, and the Army furnished planes to take them over to the other islands to see who was the best team. They made many fires, and were a real protection.

You might be interested in the financing of this originally. The original allotment on December 24 was \$2,800,000, and increased on January 12 to \$15,000,000, making a total appropriation of \$17,800,000. The expenditures were \$16,408,000. We returned to the United States Treasury about \$1,400,000 unexpended. During the time that we operated, we turned into the United States Treasury some \$764,000 of registration fees, hospital fees from hospitals we were running, and by the sale of some surplus property. Before the surplus property division was established here, I was given authority from the procurement division to dispose of some of our materials here on the local market. In some cases we received what the Government had spent for it. We rented our evacuation buildings that were set up, because of our shortage in housing we made them available at reasonable rents for the people, and that totalled the amount to \$764,000.

My conclusion on this OCD effort of mine, and as a result of my experience as director of the office of civilian defense, since November 1, 1942, it has been my observation that given an impelling motive, such as a recent war emergency, there is ample assurance of a strong community cooperation. This is true with respect to all racial elements in our population.

Chairman LARCADE. Without going into the functions of the Pearl Harbor investigating committee, from your testimony it would be assumed that you were evidently expecting trouble before December 1, 1941.

Mr. BLACK. That's right. We have spoken about that, because everybody was conscious of it here. The Army and the Navy attended meetings, helping to organize these functions, and the civilian population here was ready.

Chairman LARCADE. It was an excellent idea, because having started training these forces, they were ready to function.

Mr. BLACK. That's right.

Chairman LARCADE. Immediately?

Mr. BLACK. Yes.

Chairman LARCADE. Are there any questions by any members of the committee?

Representative TAYLOR. You mentioned some organization known as the provisional police which were organized before you got the OCD into operation.

Mr. BLACK. Yes; they were.

Representative TAYLOR. Do you recall what date that they had their organization, or their origin? It is not important, if it came before your OCD set-up.

Mr. BLACK. Yes, it was organized in—I think I have it right here. You will get this in here. It was organized amongst the civilians at the request of the Army authorities in 1940.

Representative TAYLOR. 1940?

Mr. BLACK. It was to guard communications, communication facilities, water supplies, water-front areas, in order to relieve the regular trained Army personnel for front-line duty, in case of invasion. That was the reason for the set-up.

Representative TAYLOR. Was their personnel supplied with arms and ammunition, and things like that, if you know?

Mr. BLACK. To the best of my knowledge. I was not intimately tangled up with it, because that was before my time.

Representative TAYLOR. Do you know whether or not the personnel included people of Japanese origin?

Mr. BLACK. I couldn't answer that truthfully, now. There were 1,500 of these guards trained ready for action in April 1941.

Representative TAYLOR. Well, during the period that you were in charge of the OCD, did you find any evidence of disloyalty on the part of men or women associated with your organization who had Japanese ancestors?

Mr. BLACK. No; but on the contrary, the best response we received was from a great many of the locations where there was a predominance of Japanese, or people of Japanese ancestry.

Representative TAYLOR. And they assumed positions of importance?

Mr. BLACK. They did, and they did a splendid job. They were functioning and doing their stuff, and we who term ourselves "haoles" in this country kind of slighted them a little.

Chairman LARCADE. Any other questions?

Delegate FARRINGTON. For the record, I would like to state that Mr. Black is generally regarded as one of the leading able engineers of this Territory, and responsible for many of our public works, and a lot of public service for which I believe he received no compensation. I would like Mr. Black to answer that, and add something as to the length of his residence in the Territory.

Mr. BLACK. I have been here 33 years.

Delegate FARRINGTON. 33 years. You believe that Hawaii is qualified to assume the responsibility of statehood now?

Mr. BLACK. I do.

Delegate FARRINGTON. What happened to the statistics that were compiled by the OCD on the population of the Territory?

Mr. BLACK. What happened to them?

Delegate FARRINGTON. Is that record in the possession of the Territory?

Mr. BLACK. Yes. The Territory has the record of that. All of our records have been turned over to the archives.

Delegate FARRINGTON. I was wondering if these statistics had been made available to people who were making these analyses of population trends, which constitutes one of the issues in which this committee is particularly interested. You don't know what happened to them?

Mr. BLACK. I am sure that they can be gotten all right.

Delegate FARRINGTON. Most of the organization of these people of this Territory for civilian defense was undertaken in cooperation with the military authorities?

Mr. BLACK. Yes.

Delegate FARRINGTON. But isn't it true, also, that a large part of it, if not the best part of it, was undertaken on the initiative of the civil authorities?

Mr. BLACK. At the very beginning, that was true. I do not think there can be too much credit given to the people who instigated and developed this major disaster council. It was the foundation of the OCD. They had foresight, and they did a splendid job. That was a civilian effort, and it was done before the war started.

Delegate FARRINGTON. And the theory of the organization was that the problem of policing and maintaining the civil community, and the responsibility for it, should be assumed by the civilians themselves?

Mr. BLACK. That is right. They stood ready to do it.

Delegate FARRINGTON. And to let the military out, so that they could concentrate on the protection of the country from invasion?

Mr. BLACK. Yes.

Delegate FARRINGTON. I wonder if you are going to have for the record some of the very fine statements and letters that have been written by some of our military authorities about the work that was done by the office of civilian defense?

Mr. BLACK. Well, of course, Mr. Locey and I both received plaques of commendation from General Richardson, representing the Army, and expressing their appreciation for the work that the people that we represented had done.

Delegate FARRINGTON. Well, I wonder if you would be willing to submit those for the record, and also submit for the record such testimony as you have of that character, relating to the work done by people who were under your direction?

Mr. BLACK. I will endeavor to get anything I can.

Delegate FARRINGTON. If there is any such correspondence on various occasions, and any speeches that have been made, speeches in praise of fire wardens, nurses, doctors, or others in the various fields of activity. I think, perhaps, for this inquiry that it would be very valuable to have that all documented and in the record to Congress. I would like to ask, Mr. Chairman, that we incorporate it, if you will.

Mr. BLACK. Yes. You could write a book on a large scale, if you want to.

Chairman LARCADE. I think that this information would be of value, in many respects. I think it is entirely proper that it should be included in the record for reference.

Mr. BLACK. Yes.

Chairman LARCADE. If that can be obtained, the committee would be glad to have you submit that information.

Are there any other questions, gentlemen? Thank you very much. It seems as though your organization did very excellent work.

(Statement No. 1, by Mr. Black, was submitted to the committee.)

(Mr. Black was excused and withdrew.)

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, supplementing Mr. Black's statement, I would like to file four exhibits. The first is a history of the organized defense volunteers in the Territory of Hawaii.

(Exhibit No. 19 was here submitted by Mr. Robertson.)

The second is a statement of facts and figures concerning the USO. This is in the form of a letter signed by Alice H. Cooke, director of USO, addressed to Deputy Attorney General Jamieson, dated January 4, 1946.

(Exhibit No. 20 was here submitted by Mr. Robertson.)

The third is a letter signed by Arthur H. Eyles 3d, manager of the Honolulu Community Chest, dated January 4, 1946, giving some facts and figures in connection with the money given the Honolulu Community Chest, and its various uses.

(Exhibit No. 21 was here submitted by Mr. Robertson.)

The fourth is a letter from J. Howard Ellis, director of the American Red Cross. This letter is addressed to the Equal Rights Commission, and is dated January 7, 1946, giving some facts and figures in connection with the American Red Cross, Hawaii Chapter.

(Exhibit No. 22 was here submitted by Mr. Robertson.)

Chairman LARCADE. Without objection, the documents will be accepted and included in the record.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I now present Prof. Andrew H. Lind.

Prof. ANDREW H. LIND. I should like to read a brief statement regarding the population trends in Hawaii.

Chairman LARCADE. Proceed.

Professor LIND. Hawaii's population has increased nearly 4 times during the past 50 years, from about 100,000 to approximately 500,000. This phenomenal growth is chiefly the consequence of improved economic opportunities afforded by the Territory, and again largely by changes in the statistics of immigration.

During the first three decades of the present century, Hawaii's growth in population was overwhelming, through the influx of plantation laborers and their dependents. Since 1940 there has been another period of extensive movement, during which Hawaii's population has been increased by some 60,000 through migration alone. The racial complexity, likewise, of Hawaii's population, has been greatly increased by immigration during the past 50 years. Three contrasting population elements—Korean, Puerto Rican, and Filipino—have been added to the complicated racial pattern which already existed here, and important additions to immigrant Japanese and Portuguese also occurred during this period. Up to 1920, Hawaii's racial complexity had probably reached its peak with 11 major ethnic or racial groups, we call them, Hawaiians, part Hawaiians, Spanish, Puerto Rican, Portuguese, haoles, or other Caucasian, Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Filipino, and Negro.

In 1920, 57 percent of the entire population of the islands had been born outside of Hawaii or continental United States. Since 1920 the population movements have been chiefly in the direction of greater integration and interracial solidity. By 1940, for example, almost four-fifths of the population were natives of Hawaii or of continental United States, and by 1945 this ratio had increased well over 85 percent.

Similarly, the tendency for the various ethnic groups to intermarry, and thus fuse the population into a single American-Hawaiian type has proceeded to such a degree that by 1940 it was necessary for the Census Bureau to combine certain of the previously enumerated ethnic groups, showing Portuguese, Spanish, and haoles, as com-

bined into a single Caucasian group. It has become increasingly difficult to differentiate accurately between Hawaiians and part Hawaiians. Hawaii has long been noted for its intermingling of races, and experience in the past 50 years adequately confirms this impression. Definite statistics for the early period are unavailable, but since 1912 the proportion of marriages between persons of different racial ancestry has increased from 14.1 to 38.5 percent of the total. War has greatly accentuated the trend of interracial marriage, and even before the war approximately 3 out of every 10 marriages in the Territory were across the conventional race lines. Each of the various racial groups has participated in this process, some, however, to a greater degree than others.

Among the immigrant peoples it is usually those least adequately supplied with women who intermarry most readily. That is, among the Chinese, Filipinos, and most recently Caucasians, the men have more commonly looked to other groups for their wives than is true of the Japanese group. For example, native Hawaiians have always been noted for their cordial reception of visitors to Hawaii, and this has extended to marriage as well. During the 30 years' period for which statistics are available, the average out-marriage rates for both Hawaiians and part Hawaiians have been well over 50 percent.

Chairman LARCADE. Pardon me, may I interrupt you? I will suggest at this time that the committee recess for 10 minutes.

(The committee recessed at this time until 3 p. m.)

Chairman LARCADE. The committee will resume, and Dr. Lind will continue with his testimony at this time.

Professor LIND. Similarly, the smaller groups, such as the Spanish, Koreans, and Portuguese and Puerto Ricans tend to have high intermarriage rates. The effect of increasing interracial marriage is reflected likewise in the number of children of mixed racial ancestry born in the Territory. During the war years the ancestry of slightly over one-third of the babies born could be traced to two or more racial strains. Visitors to Hawaii frequently express concern regarding the possibility that a single immigrant group may take possession of Hawaii's population, by virtue of its capacity to reproduce. Actually, each immigrant group during the early days of its residence in the Territory tends to have a high birth rate, which slowly declines as the group becomes assimilated into island life. During the 1890's and 1900's it was the Chinese and Portuguese immigrants which had the largest families. In the following period, the more recently arrived Japanese had the highest reproductive rates. Since 1930 it has been the Filipinos and Puerto Ricans who have ranked highest in reproduction.

It must be noted in this connection that birth rates computed on the total population of a group may be quite misleading, particularly with a group made up largely of single men. Thus, the Filipinos, one of the lowest, show one of the lowest crude birth rates, although when figured on the basis of the number of women between the ages of 20 and 45, their rate is the highest of all the ethnic groups. The corrected birth rates for all of the racial groups had been declining during the thirties, but the war here, as well as elsewhere, has resulted in a temporary boom in the number of babies. There has been a gradual shift in the complexion of the babies born in Hawaii during the past

25 years. In the early twenties almost 70 percent of the children born were of Asiatic ancestry, with the Japanese alone constituting 48 percent of the total. Just prior to World War II the Asiatic births had declined to 53 percent, with the Japanese ratio at 34.8 percent. In the postwar period we may anticipate a further decline in the ratio of Asiatic births to something less than 50 percent.

In conclusion it may be said that examination of Hawaii's record of population and vital statistics during the past 25 years reveals a steady trend toward a citizen population of numerous racial antecedents, but unified through their common experience within an American community. Thank you.

Chairman LARCADE. Does that complete your statement?

Professor LIND. That completes my statement. (Statement No. 2.)

Chairman LARCADE. Are there any questions by members of the committee?

Mr. MILLER. I think that Dr. Lind ought to bring out some of his background, which is rather important in this case—his training, present associations, and so forth. I think it's quite important that that be brought out for the record.

Professor LIND. I am professor of sociology at the University of Hawaii, where I have been employed since 1927. I had my undergraduate training at the University of Washington, and my graduate training, including the work for the doctor's degree, at the University of Chicago.

Mr. ANGELL. Where are you from, Doctor?

Professor LIND. I come from the State of Washington.

Mr. ANGELL. How long have you been here in the islands?

Professor LIND. Something over 17 years. It's a little difficult to compute, because I have had one or two leaves in the meantime.

Mr. ANGELL. How does the rate of reproduction in the families here at present compare with those on the mainland?

Professor LIND. Our birth rate, our corrected birth rate, is still somewhat high for the entire population. But what is significant, I think, in that connection is that our birth rate is no higher than that of similar immigrant groups on the mainland, considering the length of their residence in the United States.

Mr. ANGELL. There is a marked trend, as I understand from your testimony, for racial groups to amalgamate?

Professor LIND. Yes.

Mr. ANGELL. And eventually will center, perhaps, in one race combined from all strains?

Professor LIND. The part-Hawaiian race or group seems destined more or less to absorb all the other groups here.

Chairman LARCADE. How long will that take, Doctor?

Professor LIND. That's very difficult to predict. I would hesitate to make a venture on that particular issue.

Mr. MILLER. The pattern here; has it been different from studies that have been made on the mainland?

Professor LIND. No; it has not. There have been certain peculiarities of a historical and geographic character in the local situation, but the general trends are quite comparable to those that one finds in mainland communities.

Mr. ANGELL. How do the I. Q.'s of the children in the Territory compare with those on the mainland?

Professor LIND. I would prefer to refer that particular question to my colleague at the university, Dr. Porteus, who can give a much more—

Mr. ANGELL. Will he appear before the committee?

Professor LIND. That I do not know.

Chairman LARCADE. Is Dr. Porteus scheduled, Mr. Robertson, to appear before the committee at a later time?

Mr. ROBERTSON. He has not been scheduled so far, but I think we can schedule him.

Chairman LARCADE. If that is satisfactory, at a later date we will be glad to give Dr. Porteus an opportunity to appear before the committee.

Mr. ANGELL. Do you know, Doctor, what the comparison is of the educational qualifications, particularly those who were called to the service and were rejected by reason of educational qualifications, or lack of them, compared with those called to the service from the mainland?

Professor LIND. I am not aware that that particular information has as yet been made public. At least, I am not myself familiar with it.

Mr. ANGELL. In the mainland there is a very unfortunate showing in that respect.

Professor LIND. I realize that. (See exhibit 31.)

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, the testimony that Dr. Lind has to offer is about as important as any witness that will appear before the committee, because it bears upon the character of our population. I think, therefore, that we ought to develop his point of view very fully. I want to ask at the outset to what extent he has supplemented that brief statement of his with statistical records showing the racial trends of the Territory?

Professor LIND. I may say that this statement, which actually had not been completely typed before I appeared here, was drawn together within the spare time of the last couple of days, and is drawn from very extensive studies that we have made over a period of the last 17 years. We have in published form two major studies which relate to this general problem of the experience of the population here—the one work of the late Romanzo Adams, which is probably a classic in the field, and the other by myself, entitled "An Island Community." We have also attempted to present in published form certain of the experiences of the war years, particularly with reference to the Japanese population, and a brief published study of that has already appeared, and another one is forthcoming.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Now, the scientific study of racial trends in the Territory by the University of Hawaii was started by Dr. Adams in about what year?

Professor LIND. Dr. Adams came here in 1920, and he began almost immediately on such aspects of the problem as he had time to work on. It was not, however, until 1927 that I think a formal program was instituted. At that time the Rockefeller Foundation provided some funds for study.

Mr. FARRINGTON. It was shortly after then that he began to make predictions on the basis of his scientific examination of this subject,

and isn't it generally true that the predictions that he made have proved to be sound?

Professor LIND. I think that is correct.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Are you familiar with the predictions that were made by the Office of Education of the Department of the Interior in 1920?

Professor LIND. The so-called Bunker report?

Mr. FARRINGTON. Yes. I think it would be very pertinent in consideration of this question if you would outline some of those predictions.

Professor LIND. I'm not sure that I can recall in accurate detail the predictions that were made at that time. Suffice it to say, that most of them were rather fantastic with respect to the projection of the population. It was especially noticeable in connection with the projected population of Japanese in the Territory. I hesitate a little to attempt to recall precisely what the prediction was. I have a recollection, however, that it was predicted that the Japanese would constitute some 40 percent of the electorate by the year 1930. As a matter of fact, the Japanese have not yet reached that figure, nor is there any likelihood that they ever will.

Mr. FARRINGTON. What are the reasons for that?

Professor LIND. Simply because of the size of the Japanese population in comparison to the total population.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Well, I mean, what has caused that to develop? Is it a result of a sharp decline—of the birth rate in the second generation?

Professor LIND. I think actually that the predictions that were made in this particular survey that you refer to were made on faulty scientific bases. Actually, it wasn't possible to predict with too great accuracy what the situation would be as early as 1920. The peak of the Japanese births in the Territory had not been reached until after 1924. But there has been since 1924 a steady decline in the proportion of Japanese births to the total births. Your point, likewise, that the second generation tends to restrict its birth rate, is as obvious in the case of the Japanese as it is in the case of the other immigrant groups.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Has that come yet to approximately the same pattern of the other races who have been here two and three generations?

Professor LIND. Yes. As a matter of fact, the corrected birth rates in the case of the Japanese declined very markedly between 1930 and 1940. Unfortunately, we can't make accurate statements with regard to the corrected birth rates except for census periods when we have the information upon which to base such rates.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Your inquiries are made on the basis not only of over-all statistics, but of cases?

Professor LIND. Yes.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Aren't there—and those indicate to you what influences are at work to influence that birth rate?

Professor LIND. I should say the general atmosphere of an American community, the same, shall we say, secularizing processes that operate in any immigrant group, have operated in the case of the Japanese. The desire to secure a higher level of living and recogni-

tion of the fact that too many children are going to interfere with the standard of living which the parents may enjoy.

Mr. FARRINGTON. How long do you think it will be before the alien Japanese will have been eliminated, for the most part?

Professor LIND. At the present time they constitute somewhat less than 15 percent of the entire Japanese group, and I think for practical purposes one may say that within the next 15 years—certainly that's being liberal—their influence will have disappeared.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Have you got the statistics to show how that rate of birth has declined?

Professor LIND. Yes; I have. Unfortunately it is only for the two periods that I spoke of—1930 and 1940—that we have the basis of actually computing such rates. Prior to that time the system of keeping racial statistics was such as to preclude any high degree of accuracy. Between 1930 and 1940 there was a decline. I can quote that directly: From 178 per thousand females between the ages of 15 and 44, to 89.4 per thousand female population, ages 15 to 44.

Mr. FARRINGTON. That would indicate that within a generation the birth rate has dropped in half, approximately?

Professor LIND. Yes.

Mr. FARRINGTON. There is no reason to believe that that will change, is there? I mean that the birth rate will rise in subsequent generations?

Professor LIND. I should say that the experience of the Japanese, if it is comparable to that of other immigrant groups, we may expect a slight increase in the third generation. There tends to be commonly a very phenomenal decline in the case of the second generation, and in the case of the third generation there tends to be, shall we say, a more normal birth rate.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Well, now, what has been the over-all rate of increase when you take into account the deaths? Has that rate declined or been constant, or has it increased?

Professor LIND. The only single index that we have, which—simple index—which incorporates both births and deaths is what is known as the vital index, which is simply the births divided by the deaths times a thousand. And here again we find that the vital index of all of the immigrant groups in the Territory have tended to decline over the period for which we have such figures.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Now the most important changes in our population during the last 25 years have come about as a result not so much of the changes in the birth rate but of immigration, have they not?

Professor LIND. That's true.

Mr. FARRINGTON. During the period of 1920 to 1930 we had a considerable influx of Filipinos, and an influx of white people from the States. Then in the period between 1940 and 1945, there was again a heavy influx of white people, and in consequence of that the Caucasians on June 30, 1945, became the largest ethnic group in the Territory.

Professor LIND. That's right.

Mr. FARRINGTON. That was the result of extraordinary conditions, and I'd like to ask you if, in your opinion, the termination of the war and the defense activities will result in a substantial decline in that group?

Professor LIND. I would certainly expect that the number of Caucasians in the population would diminish somewhat as a consequence of the slowing down and the termination of certain defense activities. And it is not at all impossible that the Japanese may again become the largest single ethnic group in the Territory for a period of time. But certainly we may expect that in the long-range experience of the islands the Japanese will be definitely subordinated in terms of actual numbers to the swelling group, particularly of Caucasians and Hawaiians and part Hawaiians.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Of course it's altogether probable too that with the development of air transportation and our tourist industry we will have in the next 5 or 10 years an enormous increase in our Caucasians?

Professor LIND. That certainly is a very real possibility.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Do you anticipate that that's likely?

Professor LIND. How large that influx will be, I don't think I am as well qualified to say as certain other persons more directly connected with the tourist industry.

Mr. FARRINGTON. To what do you attribute the rapid increase in the number of part Hawaiians?

Professor LIND. Well, it's—

Mr. FARRINGTON. That may be an unfair question, Mr. Chairman. I'll withdraw it, because the answer, of course, is obvious—because they are so attractive.

Professor LIND. I think there is something more to it than that. Certainly that is an important factor, but this being Hawaii there is somewhat greater disposition to cling to the Hawaiian ancestry than to perhaps any other single ancestry of the various groups that are represented here. And some individuals who intermarry with the Hawaiian or part Hawaiians tend to regard themselves as part Hawaiians, I should say their children tend to regard themselves as part Hawaiians. And I think, as Delegate, former Delegate King pointed out this morning, an individual with seven-eighths white or a combination of various ancestries and who has only, let us say, a sixteenth Hawaiian, still regards himself as a part Hawaiian.

Mr. ANGELL. Somewhat akin to the fact that a good many million came over on the Mayflower?

Professor LIND. Quite.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Is it your observation that there is a tendency developing to depart from the traditional attitudes of racial tolerance in the Territory, or that the reverse is true?

Professor LIND. I should say that we have had during the period of the war some rather serious strains upon the traditional patterns of racial tolerance here. There have been introduced into the community certain elements which have not had the background to appreciate the type of race relations which have existed here. It is my own conviction that despite the tensions that have existed in the Territory during the period of the war, the traditional pattern of race relations will in substantial proportion remain.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Do you feel that the marked improvement in the economic position of some of the racial groups that has come about as a result of the war will tend to disturb that pattern?

Professor LIND. It already has, to some degree. And I think that is a common experience in any wartime community. It's perhaps on a smaller scale. The sort of difficulty which mainland communities have experienced with reference to the Negro problem.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Well, on the basis of your study and observation, would you be willing to entrust to the Americans of Asiatic origin the full responsibilities of American citizenship?

Professor LIND. Certainly. I would regard the American of Asiatic ancestry, with whom I have had experience, as being quite the equals of the individuals of any other ancestry in the Territory, and I would assume that they would exercise those responsibilities with the same sense of the responsibility that has been entrusted to them as any other ancestry.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Is there any other place in the country where there is a situation at all comparable to what we have in Hawaii, so far as our racial relationships are concerned?

Professor LIND. It's a little difficult to make sweeping statements of that sort. I personally am not aware of any community in the continental United States where there is as ready and as cordial a fraternization and association between the various racial groups as we have here in the Territory.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Can you, would you undertake to make such a statement about the world?

Professor LIND. I think actually that there are areas elsewhere in the world where a pattern somewhat comparable to that of Hawaii—certainly Brazil has a pattern of race relations which is somewhat comparable. There are significant differences, however.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Well, now, to what do you, to what influence do you attribute the development of this pattern, as we describe it?

Professor LIND. Well, I think there are a number of important factors in explaining the evolution of Hawaii's pattern of race relations. I should say that the fact that the contacts between the native Hawaiians and the white men were instituted on a basis of trade rather than of conquest is an important factor in this connection. There was no disposition on the part of the early visitors to Hawaii to superimpose their control or their conceptions of life upon the native population. As a matter of fact, the very success of the traders who first came to Hawaii depended upon their treating the native Hawaiians with a considerable degree of respect and deference. They could very readily have been put out of the Territory or the islands. Certainly their trading experience could have been cut off, had they not enjoyed the good will of the native population. There are a number of other historical factors of fairly significant importance. I should say the early arrival of a group of missionaries whose very conception of themselves and of their task necessitated their dealing with the natives as ordinary human beings and not as belonging to some lesser breed outside the law. I think that there are, perhaps, a number of minor historical factors that might play a more or less significant role, but personally I should place the one that I mentioned first as being of paramount significance.

In other words, I don't think we need to assume that the people, the whites that first came to Hawaii, were necessarily of a superior moral character to those that went to other regions of the earth. But I think

the circumstances of their coming here were such as to, if you will, necessitate their dealing with the native populations on a basis of equality. And that pattern, once established, must of necessity be carried on.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Isn't it true also that the very diversity of our racial structure has tended to make a harmonious relationship important to our progress?

Professor LIND. I think that is true.

Mr. FARRINGTON. The very practical problem?

Professor LIND. Yes. We have never had merely a single white group and a single nonwhite group here as has been the experience of numerous other areas.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Is it your observation that any racial group tends to be more cohesive in its activities than the others? What comments do you care to make about that, particularly with reference to the second generation?

Professor LIND. I should say that as far as the second generation is concerned there are no substantial differences between the various groups.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Farrington, before we get away from this particular subject, would you mind if I propounded a question?

Mr. FARRINGTON. No; I don't mind.

Mr. MILLER. Relative to these groups being brought into other racial groups and reverting back to the States, wouldn't it follow the same pattern here, do you think, that has been followed in the Southwest where, let's say in New Mexico, where a group has been brought economically into another group, in the case of the Spanish-speaking people down there, is there any parallel that could be brought from that?

Professor LIND. I'm not sure that I realize what part of our previous discussion you were referring to in that connection.

Mr. MILLER. Well, when we were talking about bringing particularly these economic groups, racial groups, into the pattern of citizenship that we set up for this country, or we assume for it, that thought struck me. You had been asked by Mr. Farrington whether this condition had been paralleled elsewhere. You said not in the United States. Then he asked you, I believe, if you would extend the boundaries of that thing, and at that time it struck me that in the Pacific Southwest, in California, we might have had the same thing but for the gold rush that drew people in there very rapidly. But even in the case of Louisiana you have had racial groups that have come in and preserved, without losing any of their American standards, certain of the traditions that have enriched rather than decreased their value as American citizens. Now can we draw any parallels from New Mexico or Louisiana or—

Professor LIND. I think actually there are numerous parallels of that sort, of groups such as the Pennsylvania Dutch, let's say, which have preserved certain elements of their traditions without interfering with their participation in the normal functions of citizenship. Certainly you have certain groups in Louisiana of that sort. I'm unfortunately not as well acquainted with the experience in New Mexico and the actual relationship which obtains between the Mexi-

cans and the non-Mexicans, but I would presume that that same situation obtains there.

Mr. MILLER. I presume it's the only other place in the United States where they recognize the dual language as the official language set-up, where Spanish and English are recognized as the official languages of the country, just as you recognize Hawaiian and English here.

Professor LIND. That's true.

Mr. MILLER. And there is that parallel, that thing has enriched rather than degraded the people there. There has been a complete understanding.

Professor LIND. Quite.

Mr. MILLER. Excuse me, Mr. Farrington.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Now to come back to the cohesiveness of these people in the second generation, is it your feeling that any particular group tends to be more cohesive than the others racially?

Professor LIND. I should say that, speaking of the population as a whole, throughout the Territory, it would be exceedingly difficult to make any absolute, categoric statement that one group has been more cohesive than another. The Japanese, for example, are frequently charged with being cohesive in certain areas, and in certain situations. I think it's the type of charge which is almost inevitable, and which develops in any parallel situation. But it has been by observation that if the Japanese in a particular community have been disposed to fraternize and to associate more particularly among themselves, it is a consequence of the fact of, let us say, such a factor as the large proportion of Japanese that happen to be resident in that area. For example, in the Kona coffee-raising region, the Japanese constitute a fairly important proportion of the total population. Well, out of the sheer numbers that are there, and the paucity of members of other groups, it becomes necessary for the Japanese to associate with Japanese. On the other hand, there are evidences of Japanese in other areas associating, having their closest friends with non-Japanese.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Isn't it, or is it generally true that in the second and third generations the factor of race tends more and more to be less important than the consideration of, say, economic position, religion, for instance, and training, and that sort of thing?

Professor LIND. Yes, quite. The particular interest of the individuals involved very frequently serve to place race in a relatively unimportant position.

Mr. FARRINGTON. And that probably applies to their political thinking and activity as much as it does to their other activities?

Professor LIND. I think it would.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Have you ever, in the course of your studies, made any examination of the relative economic position of the racial groups?

Professor LIND. We have attempted, among other things, to secure some reliable index of the economic position of the various immigrant groups. Unfortunately, I say unfortunately, from the point of view of our particular study it hasn't been possible to secure any absolutely reliable and thorough-going index of that sort that could be applied to the various racial groups. We have certainly, from the reports of the census, an indication that the haole tends to be at the top.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Economically?

Professor LIND. Economically. And the Hawaiians and the other groups are arranged in intermediate positions below, with the most recent immigrant groups at the bottom. But the situation in that respect is different now from what it was 20 years ago, or 25 years ago.

Mr. FARRINGTON. As their economic position improves, is there a tendency to divide on the basis of religion, politics, and for like reasons? The point I am trying to develop is that as these people come into the benefits of American citizenship under the pattern of life that prevails in this Territory, they tend to reach their decisions and take action on the basis of considerations other than race?

Professor LIND. Quite.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Such as their economic position?

Professor LIND. Certainly.

Mr. FARRINGTON. And that the businessman holds to one point of view that might be expressed by the chamber of commerce, whether he derives his ancestry from the Orient or the Occident?

Professor LIND. Exactly.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Whereas the man who works with a pick will derive his point of view from the CIO or the American Federation of Labor, such as the case may be?

Professor LIND. Yes; I think it's very interesting in that connection that the labor unions in recent years have been so largely interracial in their constituency, and that you have had all the various ethnic groups here represented in the labor movement, with their common aims more or less directed against, in certain instances, the plantations. On the other hand, you have oriental employers who look askance at the labor development among oriental workmen.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Now isn't it a matter of fact that in the Territory of Hawaii we have never had to contend with movements like the Ku Klux Klan, that were calculated to subordinate or injure a particular racial group, or on the other hand have we had minorities organized in order to advance their position?

Professor LIND. That is true.

Mr. FARRINGTON. In other words, they have, within this pattern of our life, they have been able to realize their rights through the normal democratic process and have not tended to withdraw to groups on a racial basis?

Professor LIND. By and large that has been true. There have been, particularly in the early stages of the assimilation of each of the various groups, certain exceptions. For example, we have had in times past strikes that have been organized exclusively on racial lines. We had back in 1909 the famous Japanese strike. We had another in 1920. The 1924 plantation strike was predominantly a Filipino strike. And we have even had as recently as in the thirties small demonstrations of that sort among the most recently arrived immigrant group, the Filipino. I see no prospect of such a development during the decade that lies ahead, or during the period that lies ahead, by virtue of the fact that the labor movement, which has become so completely established here, is clearly interracial in character.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Do your studies include the voting record of the people of the Territory and their participation in politics generally?

Professor LIND. Insofar as that is possible. I may say that in 1938

the practice of keeping separate racial statistics was abandoned. I should say we have no statistics later than 1938 as to the racial ancestry of the registrants or the voters. The only information that we have since that period of time is the sort of material that we can obtain through talking with people who are in the know.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Would any of that information tend to lead you to believe that any racial group might organize itself to win most of the principal elective offices of the Territory?

Professor LIND. Well, I should say the possibilities of that sort of thing occurring under the set-up here are most remote. Certainly it would be entirely unsuccessful if it were to be attempted. I see nothing, however, in the experience of any of the groups that would indicate that they were so, shall we say, politically inept as to attempt a venture of that sort.

Mr. FARRINGTON. In other words, the trends of our population are such that they disabuse your mind of any apprehension as to what might be done by, particularly, the American of Japanese ancestry?

Professor LIND. I should say that the only prospect of a group such as the Japanese, who, in particular areas for example, may constitute as much as 40 percent, and conceivably in the future they might constitute in a particular locality even more than 50 percent of the voting population. The only prospect of such a portion of the population organizing for the purpose of controlling the electorate would be if there were discriminatory treatment directed exclusively toward the Japanese. I do not see, however, that under the experience that we have had in the Territory up to the present time there is any prospect of such discriminatory treatment ever coming to pass.

Mr. FARRINGTON. In other words, there is much less likely to be a movement which stems from a racial basis than from a movement that stems from economic conditions as a base?

Professor LIND. Far less. I should say far less on the basis of race than from economic considerations, far less.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I don't want to monopolize all the time, but I wanted to develop the facts which I know will relate to issues that are very much in the minds of many people, particularly in the Territory.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, I think this line of questioning is very, very important on this whole problem of statehood.

Chairman LARCADE. I quite agree with you.

Mr. FARRINGTON. The opponents of statehood in current conversation state that in the event we became a state the Americans of Japanese ancestry, by reason of their numbers, would move in and occupy most of our public offices. And I think that it's to the interest of the Territory and the country that we just lay that on the table and look at it and find out if there is any basis for those fears. I think it's true, Dr. Lind, that shortly after we became a Territory there were great fears expressed about the native Hawaiians?

Professor LIND. Exactly.

Mr. FARRINGTON. I can recall distinctly great fears about what the Chinese would do—when Dr. Ten Chiang was elected to the Board of Supervisors. He was no sooner elected than another American of Chinese ancestry was put up and defeated him. That is more or less the history of American politics.

Professor LIND. I think it would be fair to say that the strongest political opposition has stemmed usually from persons of the same racial ancestry.

Mr. FARRINGTON. That's generally true.

Mr. ANGELL. Have you any statistics to show any of the rate of amalgamation of the Japanese and other racial groups?

Professor LIND. I have the figures on intermarriage, and also the official figures on the number of children born of mixed Japanese ancestry. Just a very hasty statement with regard to the experience of the Japanese might be as follows:

Prior to the war there were relatively few of the Japanese who intermarried with the other ethnic groups here. In the early thirties, for example, it was only around 5 percent of the entire group who married during a particular year, who married outside of the Japanese group. That rate has increased during the thirties, and by the beginning of the forties about 1 out of 15 of the Japanese brides found non-Japanese husbands. Since the war it has increased to the point where 1 out of every 5 Japanese girls finds a non-Japanese husband.

Mr. ANGELL. How does it compare with intermarriage with other ethnic groups?

Professor LIND. In general it has been lower. That is largely a consequence of the fact that—two facts—in the first place that the sex proportions in the Japanese community have been more normal than they have in most of the other immigrant groups. In other words, they were better supplied with women to provide wives for the men. The second factor is that the Japanese group is so large that under normal circumstances the associations of a young person of Japanese ancestry may more commonly be with Japanese than non-Japanese. It is probably also that the family solidarity in the Japanese community is somewhat greater than it is in certain of the other immigrant groups. It would be particularly true in contrast with, let us say, the Puerto Rican.

Mr. ANGELL. Do the Japanese mingle socially with the other groups?

Professor LIND. Certainly they do. The young people do. During period of the war there have been certain visitors to the islands who have been a little bit dismayed at the ease with which our local girls have associated with the GI's.

Mr. ANGELL. Are there restrictions on immigration that affect this problem you are discussing?

Professor LIND. Very definitely. Of course, as you know, immigration from the Orient is substantially cut off, and the only likely importation, or immigration, I should say, into Hawaii of residents from outside the United States is from the Philippines, which is still possible under Federal law.

Mr. ANGELL. Is there any restriction on Philippine immigration coming into the territory?

Professor LIND. Yes; any such importation of Filipinos has to have, as I understand it, the approval of the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. ANGELL. Are there many who come from the mainland to the Territory of the racial groups that we are speaking of, who remain here permanently?

Professor LIND. There has been relatively little movement from continental United States to Hawaii of non-Caucasians. The over-

whelming majority of the people that have come to Hawaii from continental United States have been the so-called haoles, or Caucasians.

Mr. ANGELL. There are no restrictions in law?

Professor LIND. Not to my knowledge. The fear expressed by some people that our Japanese population might be very greatly increased by the movement of Japanese from continental United States has, so far, certainly not materialized, and I see no prospect of its developing later.

Mr. ANGELL. Is there any marked movement from the Territory into continental United States of any of these racial groups?

Professor LIND. The movement of first-generation Japanese to continental United States is, of course, controlled by Federal law, and there has been a certain amount of movement of second and third generations, but by and large I think it must be said that the non-Caucasians born in the islands have found Hawaii a more congenial place to live than any other region in the United States. There is a prospect that a certain number of the AJA's who have had service overseas may prefer to try out for a period of months, or even of years, of some community in the mainland with which they have had a pleasant experience.

Chairman LARCADE. I'll take the sense of the committee as to whether we shall continue further or resume hearings tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock.

Mr. TAYLOR. I'd like to adjourn now.

Chairman LARCADE. Do any other members of the committee have any questions they would like to propound to the doctor?

Mr. MILLER. Is the doctor coming back?

Chairman LARCADE. That's what we want to find out.

Mr. MILLER. I haven't any questions, but I think he has some valuable material, and he had a very short time, as he said, to get it together. We will be here about 10 days. I think the doctor should be encouraged to whip into shape some of those statistics, and file it in a brief. It needn't be done until we are about ready to leave the islands, so he'll have about 10 days to get it into Mr. Silverman's hands. I think it would be very important for the record.

Chairman LARCADE. Thank you very much, doctor, and we'll be glad to have you submit any additional data that you may have or might prepare before the committee leaves the territory.

Professor LIND. I'll be glad to do that.

Chairman LARCADE. The committee will now stand recessed, and we will resume hearings tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock.

(Hearing adjourned at 4:04 p. m., January 7, 1946.)

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII

TUESDAY, JANUARY 8, 1946

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE TERRITORIES,
Iolani Palace, Honolulu, T. H.

The committee met at 10 a. m., Hon. Henry D. Larcade (chairman) presiding.

Chairman LARCADE. The meeting will come to order. The committee desires to announce that it will hear the proponents on the questions being considered by the committee first, and after those proponents have testified the opponents will be given every opportunity to present their views to the committee. The committee will be in session until Thursday evening, and will resume here again next week. If the testimony is not completed, if any one should decide to appear before the committee, we will be glad to have them do so next week, if they do not have an opportunity to appear before the committee this week. But the committee desires it to be understood that they will endeavor to give each and every one a full opportunity to appear before the committee and present their views for or against the questions under consideration. Judge Robertson.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, we present Dr. Nils P. Larsen, president of the Honolulu Medical Society. He is accompanied by Dr. Homer Izumi from the same organization. Perhaps that may be taken as an illustration of interracial cooperation.

Chairman LARCADE. The Chair recognizes Dr. Larsen and Dr. Izumi. You may be seated and proceed, gentlemen.

Dr. LARSEN. Mr. Chairman, at last Friday's meeting of the medical society a memorial was presented which indicated the idea of the physicians. There were 98 physicians present at this meeting, and there were no objections to the statements made which were presented before the statehood committee. Our feeling was this: As physicians, perhaps we could indicate by accomplishments in the field of health whether this community was ready to take its full place in sharing the responsibilities of a republic. Whether this preliminary period had attained actual accomplishment we felt could be indicated well by the health records as they have been made by the people of this community. We realize if we didn't have the cooperation of the total population of these different nationalities we couldn't attain advance in health work. If these people, on the other hand, had the intelligence and ability of being good Americans, then we would expect progress in this field of health education. I would like to present from the standpoint, first of the doctors, that this society of professional men contains in their membership 67 doctors with a Japanese background, 41 with a Chinese background, 5 with Korean,

1 with Hawaiian, and 137 with European backgrounds. These men are all graduated from class A medical schools in the United States. They work together, as perhaps is indicated by the fact that the chairman of my public relations committee, Dr. Izumi, was picked because he had, I felt, more good will among the total membership than any other member, and also he had the diplomacy to make the community contacts which I felt we were anxious to have. The other men get together very frequently, and we feel it is an illustration that, as professional men, we can cooperate without any feeling of racial antagonism.

As to organization, I'd like to show here—this is the Journal of the Medical Association [exhibit No. 23]. Again, if these doctors of the various races were not of good quality they couldn't publish a very acceptable medical journal. Among the plantation men, the industrial physicians of Hawaii, they also publish a magazine, which this represents, taking up the various problems that have to do with better rural community health for Hawaii [exhibit No. 24].

Third, these industrial physicians are organized in such a way that at an annual meeting they were able to put out a publication, of which this is an illustration, showing the excellent type of both research and medical work that is being practiced in rural Hawaii. As I say, this could not happen unless we had people who were able to respond [exhibit No. 25].

To indicate this response, I will show you just a few records, of which I will merely indicate what happens in our rural areas in an organization which, when this study was started, had a population of 105,000 people; last year about 80,000. You will note these curves which have been kept now over a period of 12 years. We see an infant mortality that starts here and goes down, because this is one of the indices that is recognized the world over as an index of whether good medical work is being done in a community. Last year among this group the infant mortality was 22 per thousand births. The best State in the Union—Connecticut—last year showed 29.6. The total for the Territory—and I won't take up the Territorial figures, because Dr. Wilbar will present those later—but the Territory was 30.3. This index can only be accomplished with good health work. The fact that we started, and all you have to do is to go back to the figures, say, in 1900 and for the first 10, 20 years after that, and you get the figures which follow very well our best States today. For instance, the worst State last year, from the health standpoint, had infant mortality of 90.90 infants died for each thousand born in that State. In Hawaii only 30 died of each thousand, and the best State in the Union was just barely behind that.

When it comes to maternal mortality, in some of the States as many as nine women die for each thousand that deliver a child. In this group that I am speaking of—these rural women—less than 1 per 1,000 died, and 2 years ago it was 1 per 2,000. Last year it was 1 per 1,400 births, which is a real record in maternal protection in a community. And among this group of mixed nationalities who make up the population of our rural areas, practically all of them came to an up-to-date hospital to be delivered of their children.

The other records, which are many, we can show. Here is the live-birth record, and although it's going down—it starts here at

105 per 1,000 women of child-bearing age, last year it was down to 78. However, if you compare that with New Haven, which was 50, we see we still have a healthy birth rate, not an overly high birth rate, and we are hoping it won't go below 78, because we believe that's a very normal birth rate.

The total mortality we see runs extremely low. Last year it was well under 6.

When it comes to tuberculosis, although we still run pretty high alongside of some of the States, we still have shown a decline from 200 to 100 among this rural group during the past 10 years. When it comes to the question, are these people intelligent enough to seek up-to-date medical aid, we present this figure, that out of these 100,000 people who were carefully studied we see that they sought the doctor, that is, they came for medical experience, medical attention, at a rate of 500,000 per 100,000 population. In other words, five calls per person, average, which indicates they did come and seek advice. Unless these people had developed to the point where they really understood what we might call loosely perhaps our Americanization, I believe they would not have come. I realize, of course, that we have all kinds of prejudices. When I myself came to America our family, our red stocking legs were pinched. We were called squareheads, we were called all kinds of things. We believed in America because it gave the idea of justice. This small remnant that is always a prejudicial group are people who will also call my friend Izumi here a Jap, and all Japs are alike. But we feel the evidence we show is when these Japanese or Germans or Swedes are given the opportunities that America gives, that they will become as fine American citizens as any other group that has made up America. And when they are surrounded by complete prejudice, perhaps we sometimes can develop abnormal behavior such as we ourselves, imperfectly, certainly, would develop if we weren't surrounded by this essence of the freedom and justice of America. And, therefore, I feel as we present this, I'd like to feel we are presenting evidence, not prejudice, that we are presenting the accomplishments and not gossip. And if we say anything that is just pure gossip, I want you to object to it.

I want to present one other thing, and that is this circular here [Exhibit No. 26], which shows a record of 65 doctors who left the Territory to go into the service in this past war. Of this group there were 45 of European extraction, 11 of Chinese, 6 Japanese, 1 Hawaiian, 1 Chinese-Hawaiian and 1 Korean. One of the Chinese doctors gave his life at Guadalcanal. Dr. Izumi and many of the other doctors volunteered. In spite of having a wife and family they felt they wanted to show their obligation to America by volunteering. Most of these Japanese were refused the chance to serve their country because of the misunderstanding toward their race as a whole. The fact is that the medical society, when these doctors came back, not only welcomed them back but were willing to publish their names in the daily newspapers for several days, saying, "People of Hawaii, we want you to remember these men who have served our country, and when they come back we want you to remember that fact."

We also have an organization here known as the HMSA, a medical insurance group, which allows people to get insurance, complete

medical coverage, for a remarkably small amount. I got this this morning from Dr. Izumi, who had checked it for me. \$2.00 a month gives these people complete medical coverage. In comparing this type of coverage, for instance, with the Murray-Wagner-Dingell bill a man who earns \$3,000 a year and has three children, under the Murray-Dingell bill would have to pay \$120 a month and his employer—I mean \$120 a year—and his employer would have to pay another \$150 a month, a year. Under this scheme in Hawaii, which is working with over 10,000 people, members, the total a family pays is \$96 a year for this medical coverage. This plan has been recognized as being a very excellent plan in many of the States, comparable with the best, and better than a good many. We feel that also indicates not only good organization, but the fact that the people of Hawaii recognize the benefits of an insurance system. I feel that is sufficient, unless there are questions that you would like to ask [statement No. 3].

Chairman LARCADE. Any questions by the committee?

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the witness a question or two.

Chairman LARCADE. The chair recognizes Mr. Angell.

Mr. ANGELL. Is that service you have just discussed purely voluntarily and paid by those who participate in it?

Dr. LARSEN. Yes, sir; and it is organized by a group of intelligent laymen in the community, with the cooperation of the medical society.

Mr. ANGELL. No Federal aid?

Dr. LARSEN. No, sir. Every doctor has a right to serve, every doctor in good standing.

Mr. ANGELL. Self-supporting?

Dr. LARSEN. Self-supporting.

Mr. ANGELL. Is the medical profession in accord with it?

Dr. LARSEN. One hundred percent cooperation with it.

Mr. ANGELL. Do patients select their own physicians?

Dr. LARSEN. They have a free choice of physician.

Mr. ANGELL. Do they have hospital care?

Dr. LARSEN. They have hospital care.

Mr. ANGELL. And maternity care?

Dr. LARSEN. And maternity care.

Mr. ANGELL. That's all included in that brief?

Dr. LARSEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. ANGELL. The plan seems very reasonable.

Chairman LARCADE. What is the percent of tuberculosis in the Territory?

Dr. LARSEN. The group I have—Dr. Wilbar will give you figures for the Territory—was 101 new cases among this industrial group last year. The year before was 101.

Mr. MILLER. How many doctors are there in the Territory?

Dr. LARSEN. In the Territory? I can only answer for my own association.

Mr. MILLER. Well, let me put it this way: You gave us a break-down of 65 doctors that entered the service—45 of European extraction, 11 of Chinese extraction, 6 of Japanese-American extraction, and the others were broken down. Now of that 65, how many remained, or how many—is that the Honolulu County Medical Society?

Dr. LARSEN. No; the break-down I gave you was the total of the Territory of doctors going to the service. The Honolulu County has 250 doctors, 67 doctors of Japanese background, 41 of Chinese, 5 of Korean, 1 of Hawaiian, and 137 of European.

Mr. MILLER. In other words, 45 of 137 went into the service, 11 of 41 Chinese went into the service?

Dr. LARSEN. That's right.

Mr. MILLER. Six of the Japanese—67 went in?

Dr. LARSEN. Yes; but of course—remember we can't give you the figures of the total number of Japanese doctors who volunteered, of which there were a great number, but due to a certain ruling in Washington they were not allowed to serve.

Mr. MILLER. What is the infant death rate here?

Dr. LARSEN. The infant death rate for the Territory is 30.3. For this group of industrial workers, 22.

Mr. MILLER. Well, these industrial workers, then, who are furnished some sort of medical attention?

Dr. LARSEN. The plantations furnish complete medical coverage to all men, women, and children, a class A doctor, nurses, hospitals, drugs, complete hospital service.

Mr. MILLER. That's what I want to get at. Then that 2.2 percent, 22 per 1,000, in the plantations pulls down materially the nonindustrial workers and you get the mean of 30.3, which isn't really representative of the rank and file of the people. The birth, or death rate, infant-mortality rate among the nonplantation workers then would be much higher than the 30.3, would it not?

Dr. LARSEN. Well, not much higher, when you consider some of the States.

Mr. MILLER. In other words, it wouldn't give that nice picture you have painted, doctor, compared with other States?

Dr. LARSEN. Yes; compared with the States. Connecticut, remember, has 29.6, but if you go into the slums of Bridgeport or some other cities you will find the infant mortality very high. The colored groups in one of the States—

Mr. MILLER. I was just interested in this one certain group, and I am very conscious of why the effort is made to keep down that mortality. The United States Steel Co., you know, many years ago introduced a plan among the children of the South to get away from making corn bread in a certain way because it bred stomach disorders in the people who worked for them, and there was too much time lost. They weren't interested in the morals, they were interested in the financial results. I credit this 22, but I just wonder if you give us a proper picture of the rest of the Territory.

Dr. LARSEN. Perhaps we should say this, then, that this thing we call intelligent selfishness is the recognition that any organizer, any head of the government or the head of any organization considers the happiness and welfare of the group under him is necessary for the total health of a community. You might say he does it on a dollars and cents standpoint.

Mr. MILLER. I have no fight with him for doing it on a dollars-and-cents standpoint—let me make that clear. I would also like to see government do it for altruistic motives.

Dr. LARSEN. Could I give you a few figures on the Pacific? I have twice gone around the world and tried to see what happens in other

countries. When I go to a city like Bangkok and find an infant mortality of 190 in late 1938, and in Yokohama of 135, and in certain Chinese sections of from 400 to 500, and I realize that most of our people came from those places, I feel an excellent organization and cooperation of the people who came here with our health authorities and our excellent health system from our board of health down, which has produced a record that stands second to none in the States of the United States.

Mr. TAYLOR. How prevalent is tuberculosis in the islands at the present time?

Dr. LARSEN. It's more prevalent than in many of the States, but it has gone down so rapidly that among this group I mentioned it had gone down from 200 new cases to 100 this past year. But that's the actual new incidence. When you take deaths—the last figure I had from Manila before the war was 350 deaths of tuberculosis, and each death represents at least from 3 to 6 new cases—then if you compare that figure with what we have, we would probably compare our present incidence just before the war of 1,000 in the Philippines to 100 among our own laboring groups.

Mr. TAYLOR. Do the tuberculosis associations watch over the general plan?

Dr. LARSEN. Yes, indeed, the board of health has a very excellent tuberculosis bureau, and they have an excellent tuberculosis association, and the tuberculosis work, for instance the public health doctors on tuberculosis, they cooperate with plantation doctors. They come to the plantation clinics and have X-rays taken. The plantation doctors call in the tuberculosis experts to go over any questionable cases. So we have actually excellent teamwork on that score.

Mr. TAYLOR. Is the disease more prevalent on the plantations than elsewhere?

Dr. LARSEN. I'm afraid Dr. Wilbar would have to answer that, because it varies so tremendously. It varies in small communities where the economic level is poor; where the dietary level is bad, we'd expect a bad rate. Where that's well controlled, you'd expect a low rate.

Mr. ANGELL. Did I understand this association you have described is an industrial workers association?

Dr. LARSEN. This is the Territorial association of plantation physicians. That's all the physicians who work on sugar and pineapple plantations.

Mr. ANGELL. Then this organization that furnishes medical care, is that restricted to workers in industrial plants?

Dr. LARSEN. You mean this HMSA?

Mr. ANGELL. Yes.

Dr. LARSEN. That has nothing to do, that is not on the plantations at all—outside of the plantations.

Mr. ANGELL. Open to anyone, and what is the total membership?

Dr. LARSEN. A little over 10,000, and it has been in operation since 1938.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I'd like the record to show something of Dr. Larsen's background, inasmuch as he has been a long resident of the Territory and has made some notable contributions to the problems of public health, and I would appreciate it, Doctor, if you would tell us from whence you came, how long you have been here, and how long you served as director of the Queens Hospital.

Dr. LARSEN. Perhaps I wouldn't be known for modesty if I have to answer this in public. I came here first in 1919, when I was still in the service. I was a major in the last war, in the One hundred and sixth Infantry, and stayed here since 1922. I was medical director of the Queens Hospital for 20 years, have been medical advisor to the McKinley High School, a school of 4,000 students, of whom 93 percent are oriental background, and there again I feel I had an opportunity to see how these boys and girls under a system of cooperative system, where they would sit around and discuss the problems, not only finance, but health, how they'd cooperate and take up with the system, they had the interest in running their own affairs, and also discussing the various problems they had. I then became medical adviser to the plantation system, and was very much interested in milk. At one point I did forget to say that if we take another index of the health of a community and intelligent cooperation, we take the milk supply of Honolulu. I happened to be on the milk commission some years ago at that time, and I believe it still holds—the milk supply for the city of Honolulu was better than any comparable city of this size in the United States. Just what the records are now I don't know, but I know the board of health keeps a careful track of our milk supply.

Mr. TAYLOR. Do you have a health law regarding pasteurization?

Dr. LARSEN. Yes; we do.

Mr. TAYLOR. Is it compulsory?

Dr. LARSEN. Compulsory.

Chairman LARCADE. Any further questions?

Mr. FARRINGTON. It's generally true, isn't it, that the development of our hospitals and our facilities for improving health have originated principally within the Territory itself, and among its own people, and privately, rather than from the outside sources, such as Washington, D. C.?

Dr. LARSEN. That is absolutely true. The other point, in a criterion of trying to indicate is the medical service, and again I reiterate, you can't have good medical service unless you have a demand from your population. Another index of good medical service is, how do your hospitals rate alongside of the hospitals on the mainland? As you all know, the American College of Surgeons, in order to keep up the high standard of hospitals, set up a minimum standard of what they considered necessary in order to give good hospital service. This is known as a minimum standard. All the large hospitals in Hawaii, and many of the small ones, even four of the plantation hospitals, have attained this rating of class A hospitals, which have more than reached the minimum standard, considered as good hospitals in Hawaii.

Now recently Queens Hospital, for instance, has received a grant from Washington to put on an enlargement, during the war, this is; outside of that I don't believe there was any outside aid to either medical or hospital work in the Territory.

Mr. ANGELL. To what extent does the Federal Government participate by grants or aids in the health services, hospital service here in the Territory?

Dr. LARSEN. In the hospital service, only this recent grant of a certain sum of money to match what hospitals had raised for expansion. As far as the maternal bill and things of that type, Dr. Wilbar will be able to answer that much better than I can.

Chairman LARCADE. Any further questions? (No response.) Would the associate of Dr. Larsen have any testimony or remarks to make? We'd be glad to hear from you, Doctor, if you desire.

Dr. IZUMI. I have no other statements to make. Dr. Larsen has covered all the facts, I think, that have been important in the hearing.

Chairman LARCADE. Thank you very much.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, we present Dr. Charles L. Wilbar, president of the Territorial Board of Health.

Chairman LARCADE. Dr. Wilbar will be recognized at this time. Be seated, Doctor.

Dr. WILBAR. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, in order to make what I have to say succinct and include the major facts, I have written it down. With your permission I would like to read it [reading]:

Official public health in Hawaii precedes that of any State in the Union. In 1839 King Kamehameha III, by royal proclamation, created a board of health, and funds were first appropriated for this board in 1852. It was not until 1869 that the first State board of health in the United States was created, when the board of health of the State of Massachusetts came into being. A governmental public health organization has been in continuous existence in the Territory since 1852 and apparently has been effective in promoting health measures, as is shown by health statistics.

Since factual data regarding living conditions in the Territory of Hawaii as they pertained to statehood were presented for the record in 1937 to a congressional committee, this report deals mainly with health conditions in the Territory from 1937 to the present time, with only sufficient reference to years preceding 1937 to indicate definite health trends.

During the past 8 years the expenditure per capita for public health through the board of health of the Territory of Hawaii has increased from \$1.66 to \$3.23 as is shown in exhibit 14a. According to the book Government in Public Health, by Dr. Harry S. Mustard, published in January 1945 by the commonwealth fund for the New York Academy of Medicine, no State or State health department but only the District of Columbia and the Virgin Islands, exceeded Hawaii in per capita governmental expenditure for public health. As can be seen from exhibit 14a, from two-thirds to three-fourth of the funds expended by the health department are funds appropriated by the Territorial legislature. From 1940 to 1945 the number of persons employed by the Territorial health department, exclusive of those assigned by the Army and by the United States Public Health Service, has increased from 302 to 525. All employees of the board of health, with the exception of the president, come under the merit system of the Territorial civil service commission.

Marked improvements in the health of the people of the Territory have occurred during the past 8 years, as is evidenced by mortality and morbidity rates. Exhibits 14b to 14h demonstrate these improvements, as compared with the United States as a whole.

The most accurate statistical records as to health conditions in a community are the mortality rates. Exhibit 14b shows how Hawaii compares with the rest of the United States in regard to the 22 leading causes of death. These death rates were compiled for 1943

by the United States Public Health Service, using as a basis of comparison the 43 States and Territories and District of Columbia which submitted figures for this compilation. It can be seen that in 17 of the 22 causes of death, Hawaii is under the national average and in 12 of these considerably under the national average. Death rates from whooping cough and syphilis in 1943 in Hawaii were moderately above the national average and death rates from tuberculosis, all accidents and automobile accidents were considerably above the national average. However, during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945, there were no deaths from whooping cough in the Territory, and, as will be shown later, venereal disease rates are now extremely low.

The general crude mortality graph [exhibit 14c] depicts a favorable comparison between Hawaii and the United States registration area. However, although crude mortality has been somewhat widely used as an indication of the state of health of a community, it is, in fact, an inaccurate method of determining the relative health of an area, since certain variables such as age distribution of population and sex distribution are not taken into account in determining a crude mortality rate. A more accurate evaluation of the health of an area than the crude death rates are the infant mortality and maternal mortality rates, which are computed as deaths per thousand live births. Comparative data on these rates are shown in exhibits 14d and 14e. It can be seen that for Hawaii the infant mortality rates, which not so long ago were considerably higher than the rates for the United States registration area, have decreased with greater acceleration than on the mainland to reach points under those of the United States registration area.

And here, if I may answer Mr. Miller's question proposed to Dr. Larsen, the infant mortality rate for the city and county of Honolulu last year was 30.3, which was exactly the same as for the Territory as a whole, and Honolulu makes up one-half of the population of the Territory, and there are no plantations in Honolulu. It's pretty general throughout the Territory, that low rate.

Chairman LARCADE. Pardon me for interrupting you. You made reference to the exhibits. Do you have them to,—

Dr. WILBAR. I thought each one of you gentlemen had a copy of the exhibits which were sent over.

Chairman LARCADE. No member of the committee has any.

[Exhibits 1-15 were presented by Hawaii Equal Rights Commission.]

Mr. ROBERTSON. Those exhibits will be filed, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman LARCADE. You may proceed.

Dr. WILBAR. (continues reading):

The maternal mortality rate for Hawaii also shows a favorable comparison with the United States registration area. Exhibit 14g shows that the death rates from typhoid fever have also declined from points higher than the mainland to points lower than the United States as a whole. Probably the most unfavorable mortality picture in the Territory is that for tuberculosis, comparative death rates of which are shown in exhibit 14f. Death rates from this disease have remained consistently higher in the Territory than on the mainland, although the decrease in incidence of deaths from tuberculosis here and on the mainland has remained approximately parallel over the

years. The rate last year was 55 deaths per 100,000 population for the Territory. The last rate we have for the mainland was a year and a half ago, it was 40. Approximately 8 percent of all deaths in the Territory are due to tuberculosis, whereas on the mainland the average is 4 percent of deaths from this disease.

Although morbidity figures are not as accurate as mortality figures in a community, due to incompleteness of reporting cases of those diseases whose reporting is required, the venereal disease rates reported by the armed forces are comparatively accurate, owing to strict regulations concerning the reporting of such diseases among military personnel. There is therefore submitted exhibit 14h, which is a comparison of the venereal disease rates of the United States Army in the Territory of Hawaii and on the mainland, as a fairly accurate picture of the relative amount of infectious venereal diseases in these areas. The decrease in venereal diseases in the Territory during recent years has been outstanding, particularly in cases acquired within the Territory which are the only types of cases local action can prevent. You see that the rates here are considerably lower than on the mainland as a whole. Venereal disease acquired outside of the Territory and discovered upon arrival here, officially reported as "off shipping" cases, although included in the official records of the Health Department, obviously could not have been avoided by health activities within the Territory.

There has been no locally acquired case of smallpox reported to the Territorial Board of Health since 1904. Vaccination against smallpox has been required in the Territory by law since 1854. Deaths from diphtheria in the Territory are a rarity; a recent death from this disease ended a 2-year period without any diphtheria mortality. Since the early part of 1942 immunization against diphtheria and typhoid fever has been required by Territorial law.

Rates of mortality and morbidity for the major diseases vary but little from island to island in the Territory, with few exceptions, so that in general the rates of each county approximate the Territorial rates.

A number of new developments in public health have occurred in the Territory since 1937. As elsewhere throughout the country, maternal and child-health activities, a program for the aid of crippled children, certain sanitary procedures and venereal disease efforts within the Territory have been considerably augmented by the passage by Congress of the Social Security Act in 1935 and the Venereal Disease Control Act in 1938. Undoubtedly, the money appropriated to the Territorial board of health each year because of these national laws has aided in the decline of infant and maternal mortality rates and venereal disease rates, as are shown in the graphs, but again it should be pointed out that this decline has been more precipitous in the Territory than on the mainland as a whole.

At the end of the last fiscal year 134 child health conferences and 33 maternal health conferences were being conducted under the auspices of the health department throughout the Territory, so that all pregnant women and all preschool children had preventive health services available to them. During the fiscal year of 1945, 90 percent of all births were attended by physicians. A school health policy, published jointly by the board of health and the department of public instruc-

tion in October 1941 and at present being revised, has aided the advancement of the application of modern principles of school health throughout the Territory. Improved maternal and child care by private physicians and by those on the plantations has greatly aided the improvement in maternal and child health.

The bureau of mental hygiene of the board of health was created by the 1939 Territorial legislature and has been in operation since July 1 of that year. This bureau absorbed the Hawaii Mental Health Clinic, which had been created during the previous year under the sponsorship of the Chamber of Commerce of Honolulu. The mental hygiene bureau, staffed by a psychiatrist and other qualified personnel, conducts a preventive and educational program in mental hygiene throughout the Territory. The 1945 legislature added a child guidance unit to the mental hygiene bureau, and this unit has been placed in operation with a trained child psychiatrist at its head. Few States have as yet developed public mental hygiene programs.

An industrial hygiene division was established in the board of health in December 1939. Since that time this unit has been busy protecting the health of workers in both military and civilian pursuits by analyzing and making recommendations concerning environmental working conditions, diet, recreation and health services in industry.

In the summer of 1943 a mosquito control division was established in the board of health and has continued to function since that time. The division mushroomed quickly at that time because an epidemic of dengue fever was starting. Funds for this activity were provided by the United States Public Health Service and the Chamber of Commerce of Honolulu, and additional personnel were assigned by the United States Army to assist in carrying on the work. The mosquito control activity has been conducted as an integral part of the bureau of sanitation of the board of health. At one time, nearly 400 men, including Army personnel, were assigned to this division. For the first time in the history of dengue epidemics, an epidemic of this disease was stopped in its tracks. The disease, though it entered a nonimmune community and reached a peak of 143 cases a week in October 1943, nevertheless was limited to 1,566 cases for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, by which time only an occasional sporadic case was being reported to the health department. The mosquito control activities in the city of Honolulu, where nearly all of the cases occurred, reduced the breeding index of the *Aedes* mosquito, the carrier of dengue, from 5.7 to a low of 0.9; the index has been maintained between 1 and 2.

Tuberculosis is the one disease which shows up rather badly for Hawaii in mortality and morbidity statistics. This disease has been vigorously attacked during recent years. A mobile X-ray unit, purchased by the board of health for taking small chest X-ray films quickly and at low cost, was placed in service in the early part of 1943. Shortly thereafter a similar type of machine was installed at the Honolulu Chest Clinic, and in just 1945 a mobile unit for taking chest X-rays, purchased by funds of the tuberculosis association and other voluntary organizations on the Island of Hawaii, was placed in service on that island and is being operated by the

board of health. While tuberculosis hospital facilities have not been quantitatively adequate to keep up with the case finding program, an appropriation of 1½ million dollars by the 1945 legislature for expansion of the Leahi Hospital, the tuberculosis sanatorium in Honolulu, will help to meet this problem in the area where it is most severe. All of the Territory's tuberculosis sanatoria are managed by competent specialists in this field and supply collapse therapy and other modern treatment for this disease. There is a tuberculosis sanatorium on each of the four major islands and the operating expenses of all of them are paid by Territorial legislative appropriation. The 1945 legislature also appropriated for the bureau of tuberculosis for the present biennium a sum twice as great as had been appropriated for the previous biennium. With augmentation of this appropriation by money from the Tuberculosis Control Act passed by Congress in 1945 and funds from the tuberculosis association, it is my belief that adequate funds are available for proper control of tuberculosis in Hawaii from the standpoint of case-finding activities. The ultimate control of this disease in Hawaii, as elsewhere, depends upon adequate living conditions for all of the people, including proper housing and proper nutrition.

Concentrated education in the field of nutrition is being applied in the Territory through the plantations, the University of Hawaii, the health department, the tuberculosis association and other governmental and private organizations. Adequate housing remains a serious problem in Hawaii, as elsewhere in the country. Considerable planning for improved healthful housing for all persons has been done by governmental and private agencies. Difficulties of putting these plans into effect were reported just before the end of the war to a congressional committee which came to Hawaii to study the housing problem, and added difficulties which have arisen since then are undoubtedly being reported to this committee by other persons and agencies.

Owing to the presence of three rodent-borne diseases in the Territory, namely, plague, endemic typhus fever, and Weil's disease, a comprehensive rodent-control program is maintained by the board of health and by the plantations. Approximately one-fourth of the funds allotted to the health department are spent for rodent control. While cases of plague among humans have occurred sporadically in the Territory since 1900, the actual number of these are few, and since 1910 they have been confined to two small areas in the Territory, one in the Hamakua district on the island of Hawaii and the other in the Makawao district on the island of Maui. There have been no cases of human plague reported from Maui since 1937. On Hawaii, in the Hamakua district, one case was reported in 1939, seven in 1943, five in 1944 and two in the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945. All of these cases terminated fatally. During the first 6 months of the present fiscal year no cases have been reported. To date this disease has not become epidemic, owing in all probability to the control measures which are continuously kept in effect. Typhus fever and Weil's disease are found in scattered areas of the Territory and require a continuous rodent control program to keep down their incidence. Their addition to mortality in the Territory is not great; during the fiscal year 1944, when the incidence of these diseases was at its highest peak,

there were reported to the health department 186 cases of typhus fever with 2 deaths and 29 cases of Weil's disease with 1 death.

The ratio of public health nursing positions in the Territory is approximately 1 nurse to 3,500 population on islands other than Oahu and approximately 1 nurse to 7,500 population on Oahu. During the war the population of Oahu increased by about 50 percent and the number of public health nurses did not increase proportionately.

Food and drug control activities of the health department have been augmented during the past 8 years with an increase of inspectors and laboratory personnel and the addition of a veterinarian to the staff of the division of pure food and drugs.

Public health laboratory services have considerably expanded during the past 8 years, and within recent months the board of health has created a bureau of laboratories to consolidate all of its laboratories throughout the Territory. There are one or more board of health laboratories on each of the major islands of the Territory, performing bacteriological, sanitary, and chemical public health analyses.

Funds have recently been acquired to augment the statistical division of the health department, but acquisition of trained personnel in this field has been slow and has prevented, up to the present time, the formulation of a statistical division comparable to that recommended by the United States Bureau of the Census and the United States Public Health Service. Within the next year it is hoped that such a statistical division will be in existence in the Territorial board of health. The Territory has been included in the United States registration area for deaths since 1917 and for births since 1929. The census of 1940 showed that 97.7 percent of births occurring in the Territory were registered with the Bureau of Vital Statistics that year.

The health education division of the board of health has been considerably augmented during the past 8 years. The staff has been increased from one person to four and the coverage of the division has been proportionately increased. The program of venereal disease teaching in the schools, which was developed in the Territory during 1944, has been adopted as a standard in many areas on the mainland according to letters and reports received.

In each of the three counties outside of Honolulu, a county health unit is maintained as an integral branch of the Territorial health department. Each of these branches performs services and educational activities similar to those performed in the city and county of Honolulu. In rural Oahu and the counties other than Honolulu, a physician is paid a salary by the board of health in each district to serve as government physician and registrar. This physician is responsible for the adequate collection of vital statistics in his area, for the determination of the cause of unattended or suspicious deaths, for the reporting of communicable diseases, for the enforcement of public health regulations, and for providing medical care for all medically indigent persons in his district. Funds for certain types of health care of medically indigent persons are also provided through the department of public welfare of the Territory and through county governments. Thus, under the present system no individual in the Territory need go without medical care if he is ill.

The above synopsis of health conditions and health activities within the Territory of Hawaii is not all inclusive. It gives only a general picture of health conditions here as compared with the mainland United States, stressing many of the major aspects of the public health program. Government participation has been stressed. Limitation of time has prevented any detailed statements regarding other health activities provided by private physicians, by the plantations of the Territory and by a number of health organizations, such as the tuberculosis association, the public health committee of the Chamber of Commerce of Honolulu, the Hawaii Territorial Society for Mental Hygiene, the United States Public Health Service, the county governments, hospitals, and other individuals and groups.

Although there is no way of determining a mathematical figure which will indicate the state of health of a community, I believe the above facts do prove that the Territory of Hawaii is an unusually healthful place in which to live, and that this record of good health has been reached over a period of years not by accident but by application of known principles of public health.

Chairman LARCADE. Thank you, doctor. Are there any questions?

Mr. TAYLOR. Doctor, in your tuberculosis program, do you have any such thing on the islands as free chest clinics, as we call them back home, where the sputum and chest examinations can be made free of charge?

Dr. WILBAR. Yes, they are present on all of the islands under the auspices of the board of health. We have one full-time chest physician in Honolulu, and on the other islands the public health nurses and the sanatoria run those clinics, and the board of health laboratories do the necessary work.

Mr. TAYLOR. Without any charge?

Dr. WILBAR. Without any charge. Those who can afford private care are referred to their private physicians.

Mr. TAYLOR. And when you find some evidences of tuberculosis existent in a person who has been examined, do you immediately commit them to one of your sanatoria here in the islands?

Dr. WILBAR. If they have tuberculosis in an infectious state they are placed in the sanatorium or on the waiting list, if the sanatorium is full.

Mr. TAYLOR. Is there a waiting list now?

Dr. WILBAR. There is a waiting list on this island, and on the island of Hawaii.

Mr. TAYLOR. A large one?

Dr. WILBAR. On this island it's large, about 50 or 60 persons, but as I said, there was an appropriation by the legislature to add over 200 beds to Leahi Hospital, which will probably take care of the waiting list, plus the new cases which will be found by the case-finding program.

Mr. TAYLOR. And do you have any instructors or teachers who go among the school children in a program to teach preventive measures?

Dr. WILBAR. Well, we work closely with the department of public instruction in that regard. They have a health education division, and our various bureaus work through them by supplying material to them and suggesting programs of teaching. It's a close cooperation there. We feel that the direct teaching should be done probably by the teachers, but we supply them with the necessary health material.

Mr. TAYLOR. Thank you, doctor.

Mr. ANGELL. Doctor, to what extent does the Federal Government participate in the health and medical care in the islands?

Dr. WILBAR. Since 1937 the average amount of percentage of the funds expended by the health department coming from the Federal Government is 23.7 percent. Now that comes through the Social Security Act, titles 6 and 7, through the Venereal Disease Control Act, some through emergency health and sanitation, wartime appropriation, and recently through the Tuberculosis Control Act of 1945.

Mr. ANGELL. That covers all participation by the Federal Government in those programs?

Dr. WILBAR. No; during the war the Federal Government assigned certain officers of the United States Public Health Service to work in key positions in the health department.

Mr. ANGELL. But I mean outside of the war service, any other participation by the Federal Government?

Dr. WILBAR. That is all the direct participation.

Mr. ANGELL. How does that compare with the participation of the Federal Government and the States of the Union on the same basis?

Dr. WILBAR. It varies considerably. The States of New York and Massachusetts get, I think it's 13 percent only from the Federal Government—Massachusetts, and 15 in New York, but most of the Southern and Western States get about 50 percent of their funds from the Federal Government.

Mr. ANGELL. So the aid given to the Territory here is less than those other States you have mentioned—the West and the South?

Dr. WILBUR. Yes, sir.

Mr. ANGELL. Thanks, doctor.

Mr. ROBERTSON. May I ask a question, Mr. Chairman?

Chairman LARCADE. Certainly.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I'd like to ask Dr. Wilbar, when the records show that during a certain year a certain number of cases of tuberculosis have been recorded, does that mean that all those cases of tuberculosis originated in the Territory, or does that include cases of persons who have come into the Territory and bringing their tuberculosis with them?

Dr. WILBAR. That includes those that have come in. We have a differentiation, but the figures we give as a whole include the mortality rates and morbidity rates, it includes all persons discovered to have tuberculosis, wherever they may have obtained their tuberculosis. And, of course, since there has been some immigration within a relatively recent time, and tuberculosis is a chronic disease, a number of these individuals have obtained their tuberculosis before they came here. We don't know how many, though.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Has a record been kept of the proportion? In other words, your tuberculosis figures there seem to give us a rather black eye. Are we probably blameable for that black eye, or does our black eye result from tuberculosis coming into the Territory from elsewhere?

Dr. WILBAR. I think that the reason our rates are so high, as Dr. Larsen pointed out—I mean they are comparatively high—is that a good many of the people here have come from areas where tuberculosis is extremely high. A break-down of tuberculosis death rates by race shows that, I think. The highest rate among the Hawaiian group,

pure Hawaiian group, is very small, but the next highest rate is among the Filipino group, which is a large portion of the population—52,000—and the next highest rate among the population is the group with Chinese ancestry, and the next highest rate is among the group of Korean ancestry. The rate among the part-Hawaiians was 44 and the rate among the Caucasians is 13 in the Territory, showing that, I believe, that we have high rates because of these people have recently come from areas where the rates are extremely high.

Now there are five States—the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico—with higher rates. Those States run 125, 67, 64, 63, 72, and in Puerto Rico 231.

Mr. ANGELL. Alaska is very high also.

Dr. WILBAR. Yes. The figures for Alaska are not given by the United States Public Health Service. I don't have those.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I'd like Dr. Wilbar to point out to the committee that insofar as Hawaii is a Territory we do not participate in legislation providing Federal aid to meet the problems you have been discussing, without specific provision; that when the bill for extending to the States aid for infancy and maternity was first passed, the Territory was not included, and special efforts were necessary in order to participate in that. And that experience has been repeated continuously within that period. If we were a State we would participate automatically in all of those benefits.

Dr. WILBAR. Yes, I know that that is true. I am personally interested in it. When the Tuberculosis Act was passed it appeared at first that Hawaii was not being included, but through efforts of our Delegate and others in Washington Hawaii was included finally in the Tuberculosis Control Act.

Mr. ANGELL. Why was it excluded in the first instance?

Dr. WILBAR. I don't know.

Mr. FARRINGTON. It wasn't excluded, but the legislative practice that followed, it was not included with a specific provision.

Mr. ANGELL. Well, my mentality may be weak, but if it is not included, I'm inclined to believe it is excluded.

Mr. FARRINGTON. I am willing to concede that.

Mr. ANGELL. I see no reason why it should be excluded. We have jurisdiction over Alaska as well as the Hawaiian Islands, and we found in many instances seemingly by reason of oversight the Territories were not included. It's quite a common procedure in drafting legislation to speak of the several States, but there being only two Territories, a careful scrutiny by your Delegate was necessary to keep the Territories covered. Often, I think, it is merely failure to appreciate the situation that the Territories were not included.

Dr. WILBAR. That would be another advantage, then, for statehood for Hawaii.

Mr. ANGELL. Definitely so.

Mr. TAYLOR. Doctor, if the tuberculosis rate is higher among the Filipinos, then it is a fair conclusion to reach, to say, that there is more tuberculosis on the plantations than elsewhere in the islands?

Dr. WILBAR. I don't have the break-down on those figures, and I can't say that for sure. I don't know offhand the difference between the rates on the plantations and elsewhere for tuberculosis.

Mr. MILLER. Doctor, before the Filipinos were allowed to be brought here, aren't they examined by the public health service in the islands?

Dr. WILBAR. Those that are about to come here now are having X-rays taken. In the years gone by examinations for tuberculosis, medically speaking, weren't as accurate as they are now. Before the small film technique was developed, finding tuberculosis by physical examination alone was a very difficult feat, and as the Filipinos were examined, but some of them had it in early stages where it is not, almost not discoverable by physical examination.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I believe that before we leave the subject of the public health, some statement should be made with reference to the prevalence and treatment of leprosy in the Territory. I assume, possibly, that Dr. Wilbar has not covered that in his statement, because it comes under a separate jurisdiction.

Dr. WILBAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. FARRINGTON. But it may be that he would be willing, or is able, to make a brief statement on it, so that the members of the committee may know the efforts that have been made by the Territory, and the funds that have been expended to meet this problem.

Dr. WILBAR. Leprosy control activities in the Territory are at a high head. There is maintained on the island of Molokai a leper sanitorium at Kalaupapa, at Territorial expense, this is under the jurisdiction of the board of hospitals and settlements—the Territory has also maintained a hospital-receiving station for leprosy patients in Honolulu at Kalihi, under the same board of hospitals and settlements, and the various governmental physicians are continuously on the lookout for leprosy cases, and also follow up parole cases of leprosy as part of their duties. The effectiveness of this system seems to be indicated by the marked drop in the amount of leprosy in the Territory during the past 20 years. I looked up the figure recently, but it was something just less than 400 known cases of leprosy not on parole in the Territory at present.

Mr. ANGELL. Does that include those at Molokai?

Dr. WILBAR. Most of them are on Molokai.

Mr. ANGELL. How many of them are there?

Dr. WILBAR. I don't know. It's over 300 on Molokai.

Mr. ANGELL. Are leprosy patients brought there from elsewhere, outside the islands?

Dr. WILBAR. Yes, that is the chief leprosy hospital. Most cases are not kept at Kalihi if they are going to need to be hospitalized for a long time. They go to Molokai.

Mr. ANGELL. I mean, are they brought from the mainland to Molokai?

Dr. WILBAR. No, they are for persons living in the Territory.

Mr. ANGELL. In the islands?

Dr. WILBAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MILLER. Will you eventually stamp it out, doctor, in time? What are the age groups of the people suffering from leprosy? Is it gradually getting into the old groups? Any indication that younger people are infected?

Dr. WILBAR. I'm afraid I can't say that. Leprosy seems to be acquired by close contact over a matter of several years, but children are most apt to acquire it more than adults.

Mr. MILLER. Well, is it dropping, though?

Dr. WILBAR. Oh, the rate has been dropping very markedly, and if it continues we hope that it will be stamped out within the period of years.

Mr. MILLER. Within our lifetime?

Dr. WILBAR. Maybe within our lifetime.

Mr. MILLER. Maybe beyond that, within 50 or 100 years?

Dr. WILBAR. Yes, sir.

Chairman LARCADE. The Federal Government contributes to that program, does it not to the Territory?

Dr. WILBAR. Not that I know of.

Mr. FARRINGTON. That, Mr. Chairman, is one point that I thought I would ask Dr. Wilbar to develop, and that is, in dealing with this very difficult problem the Territory has acted almost independently, and utilized its own funds almost exclusively. I believe there is a cooperative arrangement with the Public Health Service, but beyond that that service is maintained entirely by funds of the Territory.

Dr. WILBAR. The Public Health Service used to maintain some officers at Kalihi, but they have no full-time officers there any more. They withdrew them during the war.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, in the course of Dr. Wilbar's testimony he brought out the fact that the rate of tuberculosis was higher among the native Hawaiian people than it was among any other people of the islands. Isn't it true, also, that the rate, the health rates among the native people generally have been very poor?

Dr. WILBAR. That is true.

Mr. FARRINGTON. To what do you attribute that?

Dr. WILBAR. Well, for one thing, it's a fairly well accepted medical principle that certain racial groups, certain groups of persons who have never been in contact with certain communicable diseases and have built up no, what we might call racial immunity, when those diseases are brought in to them they have a very high morbidity and mortality rate from those diseases. Now, that's been true right on down through history in the Hawaiians. When measles was first introduced, measles is not a disease with a high mortality rate ordinarily—but when it was first introduced into the Territory an extremely high mortality rate occurred, and the same has been true of all communicable and infectious diseases which have come into this group of Hawaiians which did not have a racial immunity.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I'd like to suggest that Dr. Wilbar provide the committee with the status of the native people from the health standpoint, insofar as that has an important relationship to the operation of the Hawaiian Homes Commission, which I think the committee is planning to study.

Chairman LARCADE. We will be very glad to have the doctor submit that for the record, that information. [See exhibit 58.]

Mr. MILLER. What was that reference to the Hawaiian Homes Commission? I didn't quite get it.

Mr. FARRINGTON. The Hawaiian Homes Commission Act is a law of Congress—

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Mr. FARRINGTON. That became effective some 20 years ago, and had as its purpose the rehabilitation of the native Hawaiian people. The

people of the Territory, and particularly the then Delegate to Congress, Prince Jonah Kuhio Kalanianaʻole, felt that the position of the native people was such a serious one that special efforts should be made for their protection. I feel that it is an important part of this committee's work to examine the operation of that law, and ascertain if it can, if there is any way in which it can be strengthened.

Mr. MILLER. I was wondering in what connection.

Mr. FARRINGTON. To contend with the situation that has developed in the course of his testimony.

Mr. MILLER. Relative to tuberculosis?

Mr. FARRINGTON. Yes; and many other diseases.

Mr. ANGELL. Doctor, is it true that before immigrants came here from the outside the inhabitants of the islands did not suffer from any social diseases, did not have social diseases?

Dr. WILBAR. That, according to history, is true. In fact, the records, what records we have on health of the old Hawaiians, showed that they were an unusually healthy group of individuals. They had practically no tooth decay. Their diseases incidences, according to the history that has been written, were very low.

Mr. ANGELL. What is the record now with reference to tooth decay in the islands? It is higher or lower than on the mainland?

Dr. WILBAR. They have considerable. I don't know how it compares. Their infant mortality rate, maternal mortality rate, various communicable disease rates, are quite high among the pure Hawaiian groups compared with other groups.

Mr. ANGELL. Take the islands as a whole, are there more sexual diseases here, social diseases, than there are on the mainland as a whole?

Dr. WILBAR. No; there are many less. The Army venereal disease rates here, which are indicative of the amount of acute venereal diseases in the Territory as a whole, was 1.5. On the mainland the rate rose during the war from around 25 to somewhere around 40.

Chairman LARCADE. Any other questions?

(No response.)

Chairman LARCADE. Thank you very much, Dr. Wilbar.

Mr. DELANEY. At this point I want to make a request that we change our procedure somewhat and let these men who qualify as experts state their qualifications before we hear them, and then, so that we can be permitted to inquire as to their qualifications and what connections they might have here and what interest they might have in testifying.

Chairman LARCADE. In that connection, the chairman will say that that point has never been raised when witnesses were presented up to this time, for the reason that under the agenda it was noted that most of these men were outstanding leaders in their respective fields, and that their qualifications were established. However, it's an established procedure in law and in hearings of this kind that before a witness is usually permitted to appear that he should establish his qualifications and give his background. However, if the committee desires that the procedure be adhered to strictly, from this point on, why, I'm sure there will be no objection, for, as a matter of fact, during the proceedings this point has been brought out usually at the end of the testimony of the witnesses who have appeared up to this time, which is really the reverse of the established procedure. If the

committee desires, from this point on, why witnesses appearing before the committee will be requested to give their name and official title or the capacity in which they appear before the committee, a short biography or statement of their background to tab their qualifications and interest in the subject for which they appear, to testify. Is that the wish of the committee?

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, I think that is very good, particularly for the reason of permitting the members of the committee to know, while the witness is testifying, who he is and what his background is.

Mr. MILLER. I think that reason is quite valuable.

Mr. ANGELL. It should be in the record, anyway.

Chairman LARCADE. If that is the wish of the committee, that procedure will be followed from this time. The stenographer seems to want a recess, so we will take a 10-minute recess here.

(The committee then took a recess at this point, and reconvened at 11:40 a. m.)

Chairman LARCADE. The committee will come to order, please. Judge Robertson, are you prepared to present your next witness?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes, Mr. Chairman. We present Mr. Colin G. Lennox, president of the board of commissioners of agriculture and forestry of the Territory. He is accompanied by Mr. Ralph Elliott of the University of Hawaii. Will you state your qualifications, Mr. Lennox.

Mr. LENNOX. Mr. Chairman and members of the board, I am a citizen of Hawaii, born here, educated in these schools and part of my higher education at the University of Hawaii, finished at Cornell University in New York. For 17 years I was engaged in agricultural research here, associated with the sugar industry, and since 1943 have been president of the board of agriculture and forestry, which is the Territorial organization that has control over most of the resources in the Territory, natural resources, I am referring to. And today I would like to tell you of the natural resources and how they have been handled. Is there anything else you'd like to know?

Chairman LARCADE. I think that's sufficient. You may be seated. We will be glad to have you proceed—you also, sir (speaking to Mr. Elliott.).

Mr. LENNOX. I have prepared a statement which I will present for the record, but would like to read parts of it, and informally discuss other parts.

Chairman LARCADE. All right, sir.

Mr. LENNOX (reading):

AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

AVAILABLE LAND

The soil has been and still is Hawaii's major natural resource, and as such, is deserving of a brief analysis of how fully and intelligently it has been exploited and conserved during the economic development of these islands of the Pacific.

The present-day pattern of agricultural crops is the result of a long series of trials of different crops and their final abandonment due to circumstances beyond the control of the farmers. The most potent and exacting measure of a crop's success has proved to be the climate.

The vast majority of our tillable land lies below the thousand foot level where the climate is distinctly tropical and temperatures show little variation between winter and summer, although the Territory does enjoy climatic ranges wider than any other part of the United States. One can find the climatic conditions of high humidity, high rainfall, and high temperatures, characteristic of the deepest Tropics, within a short distance of locations which experience below freezing temperatures each winter. It, therefore, follows that crops which will grow most satisfactorily are those which are of tropical or semitropical origin.

There are also large areas which might be tillable in the temperate zones, those lying above 3,000 feet elevation, but it has been found unprofitable to use these lands for other than grazing purposes because of a low rainfall and the inability to obtain irrigation water for them. In addition to these uplands there are large areas at the lower elevations which because of the steepness of slope, thinness of soil, rock outcroppings, excessively low or excessively high rainfall, or remoteness from a dependable source of irrigation water are not suitable for tilling and are useful only for grazing.

Other factors which have influenced the pattern of present-day agriculture have been the remoteness of the Territory from mainland markets, the high cost of agricultural labor as compared with other tropical countries and the presence of Mediterranean and melon fruitflies which preclude the export of many fresh fruits to mainland markets without destructive and costly treatments.

CROPS UNDER CULTIVATION

To understand today's agricultural crop pattern it may be well to review briefly the parade of crops which have marched across Hawaii's soils during the past hundred years. Preceding annexation, the Republic of Hawaii encouraged the immigration of a number of different national groups. Those who settled on the land naturally tried crops grown successfully in their own countries. I should like to mention some of the crops which reached a development beyond the few-acre stage. Oranges were once exported to the Pacific coast but today cannot compete in quality with those raised under the conditions of southern California. Many thousands of acres were planted to sisal on the arid lowlands but the increase in cost of agricultural labor did not permit this industry to compete with tropical regions of a low wage standard. A number of silkworm enterprises were started at different times but again climate and wage standards exerted their potent influence toward the failure of the industry. In the last 90 years three attempts have been made to launch a tobacco industry and although the quality of leaf was excellent the enterprises were not a financial success. A large rubber plantation lies overgrown with brush because of the failure of most of the trees to grow satisfactorily and the high cost of labor for tapping. Wheat was once grown in the temperate climates and exported to California during the high prices of the "gold rush" days but the success of the crop under these locations was a doubtful one due to the erratic rainfall, and without the stimulation of very high prices the risk of failure was too great. Coffee plantations of varying sizes were started on all

islands but today we find the industry confined to the Kona district, the one climatic location where the plant grows best. The rice industry was once a large and profitable one confined to the narrow valley bottoms or coastal flats. Today this industry has all but disappeared due primarily to a rising cost of labor and competition from California, where the crop is sown by airplane and harvested with huge combines, a practice which would be impossible to follow on the areas available in Hawaii. And so we may point to many other crops like cotton, vanilla, and corn which have come and gone.

The crops which form today's pattern are therefore those which survived a long period of trial and error in this new land. They presently occupy only a little more than 7 percent of the land in the Territory.

Sugarcane, a plant of the Tropics, now occupies more than nine-twelfths of the total area under cultivation. The reason for this high proportion is that this is the one crop which will grow on the tillable soil of the lowlands and which continues to bring a reasonable return from the land. It is interesting to note that the efficiency of this crop in Hawaii in terms of convertible energy produced per acre per year is three to five times that of corn.

Pineapples, a plant of semitropical origin, form the next most important crop. They occupy about two twelfths of the land area under cultivation. It is interesting to note that a small colony of 14 families arrived here in 1898 from southern California and settled on about 1,400 acres of the Wahiawa Plains. In the course of the years they experimented with a wide range of fruits and vegetables without finding a crop that would grow and for which they could find a steady and profitable market. Finally, they found in pineapples a crop which would grow well and produce a fruit of superior quality. Today these lands are in the heart of the best pineapple country of the Territory. The efficiency of pineapples is well illustrated when we note that the weight of fruit produced per acre per month on the average is almost the same as that secured in California from oranges, peaches, or pears.

In very few cases do sugarcane and pineapples compete for the same lands since the pineapple requires a semiarid low-temperature climate typical of upland plateaus where sugarcane would have to be irrigated to survive but due to a lack of available irrigation water at these high elevations the lands were never used for sugarcane.

The remaining twelfth of the area under cultivation is planted to vegetables, field crops, fruits, nuts, and berry crops which are primarily consumed within the Territory. These are the crops grown almost entirely by small farm operators as contrasted with the pineapple and sugarcane crops which are grown by large corporation farms.

Vegetable crops occupy the largest area in the small farm enterprise. A notable increase in acreage under vegetables has been effected during the war due to good price levels and a demand which always exceeded supply. Since these plants are primarily of Temperate Zone origin the production statistics show a sharp decline in volume at the lower elevations during the warmer summer months. Although part of this decline is due to a lack of irrigation water for these farms, the principle influence is temperature. There are, however, a few areas within the Territory which are sufficiently high in elevation to over-

come the temperature influence and for which irrigation water can be developed to stabilize this very important industry. It was amply demonstrated during the war when some sugar and pineapple lands were diverted to the planting of truck crops that these crops could not be profitably grown even with today's advanced knowledge of insect control, irrigation practices, and agricultural machinery at the disposal of the operators. The coffee crop of today, as mentioned before, is confined to the Kona district and occupies the next largest area in this category. Orchards planted to miscellaneous fruit crops occupy the third position in acreage with papayas and bananas filling most of the area.

LIVESTOCK INDUSTRY

The livestock industry is a large one. Approximately one-third of the total area in the Territory is in pasture used for grazing beef animals. The production of beef from these animals supplied the civilian population of the Territory with 23 percent the beef consumed in 1944. The dairy industry, through 129 dairy farms, supplies the fluid milk requirements of the Territory while the poultry industry, through 1,400 farms and thousands of backyard flocks, supplies only a part of the shell egg requirements. The swine industry increased materially during the war due to the availability of garbage from military installations and an active demand for meat products. It is an industry which has always depended primarily upon garbage as the major source of feed and will likely contract to the available volume of this feed.

THE FUTURE OF AGRICULTURE

The future of agriculture in the Territory will continue to need the thoughtful attention of all of its people in not only a planned development for new crops and further land utilization but also for a sympathetic understanding of the importance which the present agricultural crops hold for the economy of Hawaii. The importance of encouraging a larger farmer population which will operate their own farms on a full time or part time basis is fully realized but it is also realized that the production of the two major crops will be continued by corporation enterprises because of the heavy investment needed in machinery and materials to bring a crop to marketable condition. There are, however, ample opportunities to develop successful small farm projects for miscellaneous food crops from lands which are today not under cultivation or which are only cultivated in the rainy season. The greatest drawback to this present development is a lack of available irrigation water for such lands. The Territorial government is today in negotiation with the United States Reclamation Service toward making surveys for possible irrigation developments that will bring under cultivation lands eminently suited for truck crop production and where a quality product can be obtained which will meet the competition from mainland sources.

The future development of an export business of agricultural crops, other than sugar and pineapples, is not beyond the realm of possibility. It has already been amply demonstrated that tropical fruits, such as mangoes, papayas, bananas, and avocados, and tropical nuts such as the macadamia nut, can be successfully grown in certain climatic loca-

tions within the territory. New techniques in freezing and processing open this as a field for the future development of the business of supplying the United States markets with a more bountiful selection of food products. A growing export business in orchids and other tropical flowers has developed since the advent of the airplane which has good prospects of a continuing success.

AGRICULTURAL COOPERATIVES

The interest in the formation of producer cooperatives has developed materially in the past few years. The small farmer is gradually realizing that much is to be gained through organizing his sales and distribution through a cooperative effort. Today we find cooperatives of poultry, hog, and truck farmers organized under the Territorial cooperative law. Through the collective efforts of these farmers legislation to protect the methods of disposal and resale of their product have been instituted. Likewise efforts are being made for a more orderly planting and marketing of their produce in order to lessen the period of market gluts and reduce the periods of under supply. With recent enactment of legislation requiring labeling of all produce it is anticipated that more cooperatives will be formed wherein the farmers' produce will be packed at cooperative packing houses before entering the consuming markets. The development of the cooperatives is a healthy sign of the increase in small farm activity and the future stability of that activity.

LEGISLATION TO SAFEGUARD AND ENCOURAGE AGRICULTURE

The men shaping the destiny of agriculture in the Territory were early in their appreciation of the need for safeguarding the water supplies of Hawaii if the full value of the tillable soil was to be realized. The native wet forests which are the backbone of the watersheds, were rapidly being destroyed by the inroads of domestic animals foraging through them. As early as 1860 interest was shown in the effect which this destruction would have eventually upon the Islands' water supply. The Hawaiian monarchy officially took notice of the need for this protection in 1892 when they passed tax-exemption laws to encourage private owners of forest lands to protect their holdings from the ravages of grazing animals. In 1903 the Territorial legislature passed legislation for the establishment, protection, and improvement of forest reserve areas. Today approximately one-fourth the area in the Territory has been set aside as forest reserves and fences have been built to keep out injurious grazing animals. Work is also progressing with the reforestation of land areas in those reserves which were damaged before the reserves were established.

The necessity for protecting Territorial agriculture from serious loss due to the introduction of injurious insects was clearly brought home when a leafhopper entered Hawaii from Australia with sugarcane cuttings brought in for planting purposes. Without natural enemies this hopper increased to such proportions that it threatened to destroy the sugar industry, and it was only through the efforts of entomologists who found its natural enemies in New Guinea, that the leafhopper was brought under control in time. This rude awakening resulted in legislation in 1903 for the creation of a plant quarantine

service in the Territory which was modeled on that of the State of California. Today plants and plant parts entering Hawaii are subject to examination by inspectors employed by the Territorial government in order to minimize accessions of new agricultural pests. The increase in airplane traffic through Hawaii has likewise increased the hazard of the introduction of destructive insects as stowaways aboard planes. Throughout the war period the Territorial plant quarantine service has maintained close liaison with military organizations in an effort to minimize this potential danger. The United States Department of Agriculture Plant Quarantine Service has taken over the burden of enforcing the quarantine regulations at airports. It is interesting to note that Hawaii has for many years supported a protective plant quarantine service at its own expense—a function wholly assumed by the Federal Government for most States which have ports of entry from foreign countries.

Simultaneous with the establishment of plant quarantine the Territorial government established an animal quarantine to protect the livestock of the Territory. It also instituted research in methods of eradicating certain animal diseases which had become heavily entrenched. Tuberculosis in cattle was one of the worst. A technique of testing to detect the disease was developed by Territorial veterinarians and was officially put into use as part of an eradication program in 1910. This same technique was adopted by the Federal Government in 1917 as the official method for bovine tuberculosis. Likewise, the disease of glanders in horses was well entrenched here. More cases were reported for a month in Hawaii than in many States for a year. An intradermal test devised by Territorial veterinarians was adopted in 1905 in an eradication program and by 1912 the disease had been eradicated. No case of rabies has been reported in Hawaii, which may be attributed to the rigid quarantine established in 1911 on all cats and dogs entering the islands. This quarantine requires that all such animals shall remain at a quarantine station under supervision of the Territorial veterinarian for 120 days.

Quarantine measures promulgated by the Territorial government also prohibit the introduction of animals, birds, or reptiles known to be undesirable or to be destructive to agriculture. Today there are no snakes in Hawaii except a small harmless burrowing snake, 3 to 6 inches in length, which prefers termites as a diet.

In recent years considerable attention has been given to legislation which will assist the small farmer in stabilizing his business. Laws are now in effect which control the sale of both vegetable and agricultural seeds which do not meet standards of germination or quality comparable with those of the Federal Seed Act. The farmers in Hawaii growing various food crops find it necessary to use large quantities of economic poisons in order to protect their crops from insects, since in this equitable climate there are never cold periods that reduce the population of such insects. Legislation is now in effect, as in many States, which assures the farmer that the materials in the insecticides which he is purchasing are as represented on labels or in advertisements. The Territory has recently followed the lead of many States through the enactment of legislation that requires the labeling as to grade of vegetables and fruits grown in Hawaii

which are sold as fresh produce. It has been the experience of the States where such laws have been in effect for some years that they are now an indispensable aid toward stabilizing the marketing of agricultural produce. A similar law is also in effect which requires the grading of all shell eggs offered for human consumption.

OTHER GOVERNMENT ACTIVITIES DEDICATED TO ENCOURAGE AGRICULTURE

Nearly all Government expenditures, both Territorial and Federal, for agricultural research, market information, and financing in Hawaii are in the direction of assisting the farmers who grow miscellaneous crops on one-twelfth the area under cultivation and livestock farmers who range their cattle over the nontillable lands. The sugar and pineapple industries support their own agricultural research programs and organizations for exchange of agricultural, marketing, and technological information. The following are briefly some of the activities which receive Government support that are designed to assist the small farmer and the livestock men.

The University of Hawaii, through its Hawaii Agriculture Experiment Station, which is financed by Territorial and Federal funds devotes most of its research activities to these fields of agriculture. Likewise the Extension Service of the United States Department of Agriculture which is at the University of Hawaii and which is also supported by Territorial and Federal funds, has a large staff of agents in the field which carries the fruits of the research program to the farmer's door and assist him through practical demonstrations.

The Farm Security Administration of the United States Department of Agriculture maintains offices on the major islands and issues loans to farmers who are American citizens and who are not able to obtain loans from commercial loaning agencies. This agency will issue a farm ownership loan to a qualifying farmer up to \$12,000 which carries an annual interest rate of 3 percent and a 40-year liquidation period. They also issue a rural rehabilitation loan limited to a maximum of \$2,500 for a 5-year period which carries an interest rate of 5 percent and which assists farmers operating on leaseholds or property held in fee, to purchase farm equipment, seed, fertilizer, livestock, etc. This agency has outstanding more than a million dollars in the former type of loans and more than one-third of a million in the latter type. They report that the number of defaults on loans issued by the Territory of Hawaii are fewer than in most States.

The department of public instruction has obtained Territorial funds to purchase farm machinery which is leased at a low rental to farmers, through their vocational agricultural education division. This service has been a great help in certain rural areas and it is now reported that some States are inaugurating a similar service. This same division also conducts part time or evening classes in farm communities.

The board of agriculture and forestry, an organization supported by Territorial funds, maintains supervision over the operation of produce dealers who handle the fresh produce raised in Hawaii through enabling Territorial legislation.

THE FISHERIES RESOURCES

The fisheries resources of Hawaii before the war provided a large share of the protein diet for the people of Hawaii in addition to a small export business of processed fish. The administration of these fisheries was done entirely by the Territorial government through its board of agriculture and forestry. All laws regulating the fisheries were promulgated by the Territorial legislature just as is done by States administering a similar natural resource. In contrast, the fisheries of Alaska are entirely administered by the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of Interior.

The Territory maintains not only a law enforcement organization but also research organizations which study the problems of these fisheries.

Since the war, American interests have extended well to the westward in the Pacific where new horizons of fishery resources are opening. The charting of these resources so that they may be profitably exploited by American capital is a job of immense importance and size and one which should be conducted by the Fish and Wildlife Service. There is presently a bill before Congress introduced by the Hawaiian Delegate which would authorize the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of Interior to purchase research vessels and equipment in order to conduct such a survey and which authorizes the establishment of the headquarters for the research staff in Hawaii. If this bill passes and the Fish and Wildlife Service takes on the survey it will go a long way in assisting in the future development of the fisheries resources of Hawaii and the Central Pacific.

We submit, therefore, that the people of Hawaii through their elected legislative representatives have gone far in an intelligent and thoughtful handling of the resources of the Territory and that they have shown a willingness to attack problems and handle them in a way which will be best for their common welfare.

Chairman LARCADE. Thank you, sir. Any questions by members of the committee?

Representative TAYLOR. Just one, Mr. Chairman. Is the entire milk production in the island consumed in fluid form here?

Mr. LENNOX. I say all right now. Before the war there was a small percentage that was made into butter.

Representative TAYLOR. And how does the per capita consumption of milk compare with the mainland?

Mr. LENNOX. I can't give you that figure. Would you care to have me try and obtain that? [See exhibit 59.]

Representative TAYLOR. I'd like to know that, if I may—some time later. And what's the prevailing price per quart of milk here?

Mr. LENNOX. It's about 21 to 23 cents, I think.

Representative TAYLOR. And is all milk—

Mr. LENNOX. Excuse me—for the record Mr. Elliott should answer those.

Mr. ELLIOTT. As I recall, it's 20 cents.

Representative TAYLOR. Is all milk produced pasteurized, Mr. Lennox?

Mr. LENNOX. All the milk being produced in the county of Honolulu is pasteurized.

Representative TAYLOR. And do you compel tuberculin tests in your cows.

Mr. LENNOX. That's a Territorial law. They are tested annually. Before the war our percentage of reactors to total animals tested was very low. We have had a few rather serious breaks recently.

Representative TAYLOR. And with compensation to the farmer for condemnation?

Mr. LENNOX. That's right, both Federal and Territorial compensation.

Representative ANGELL. What percentage of butterfat is there in 20-cent milk?

Mr. LENNOX. About 3 percent.

Representative ANGELL. Milk—how does that compare with the mainland?

Mr. LENNOX. A little lower.

Representative ANGELL. That's due to the lack of proteins you spoke of?

Mr. LENNOX. A queer thing—no one has been able to put their finger on it altogether, but they can take animals from a Temperate Zone to a southern zone and the butterfat usually falls. All dry fats are imported. The pineapple brand, with a residue of the pineapple pulp, is sold here in a good volume, and molasses as far as it can be fed, but the protein is entirely imported.

Representative TAYLOR. How do you account for your milk production increase in 1944 over 1943, over the lesser number of cows?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I think a good number of the cows were eliminated during the war. The feed was very scarce here. Only the best producers were kept.

Chairman LARCADE. What are the possibilities for the further expansion of the sugar industry in the Territory?

Mr. LENNOX. There are other lands that are suitable for the industry if it is economical to operate them, if the price level was high enough. [See statement No. 29.]

Chairman LARCADE. What are the plans for returning such lands to sugarcane?

Mr. LENNOX. They have never been in sugarcane, the lands I am referring to.

Chairman LARCADE. Have never been planted?

Mr. LENNOX. No.

Chairman LARCADE. To what extent has land been diverted from sugarcane culture, if any?

Mr. LENNOX. To other culture?

Chairman LARCADE. Other crops.

Mr. LENNOX. Very little. The sugarcane land—unless it is to grazing—the sugarcane land that has been thrown out, to my experience and knowledge, are many of the uplands where production has been uneconomic because of the steepness of the slope or shallowness of soil—those have gone primarily into grazing; there have been some acres, a few hundred acres planted in the macadamia nut tree, this tropical nut.

Chairman LARCADE. The Hawaiian Homes Commission that is evidently interested in acquiring more land for the expansion of that agency, how would that affect the sugar industry if additional land were given for that purpose?

Mr. LENNOX. It would depend on the lands that are selected. I don't know what lands they are referring to.

Chairman LARCADE. I think that's all I have. Any other questions?

Representative DELANEY. Prior to 1940-41, did the local truck farmer produce all the green vegetables and leaf vegetables needed for the local consumption?

Mr. ELLIOTT. No; page 13 of that graph, in 1944—

Representative DELANEY. I'm not talking about 1944—prior to 1941.

Mr. ELLIOTT. 1941 is fairly representative of the earlier period. In fact, 1941 was a little bit higher, produced a little more.

Representative DELANEY. I don't know whether you understood my question. I said, did the local truck farmers produce sufficient green and leaf vegetables for the population here in the Territory?

Mr. ELLIOTT. No. [Statement No. 28.]

Representative DELANEY. Would that be because of the fact that they didn't have sufficient territory or land to cultivate?

Mr. ELLIOTT. More on account of the hot weather in the summertime. Certain leafy vegetables don't thrive on heat.

Representative DELANEY. Well, is that seasonal, is production seasonal, or is he able to produce vegetables throughout the year?

Mr. ELLIOTT. The production is seasonal. Our large season is from February to June.

Representative DELANEY. How long have these truck farmers been in business?

Mr. ELLIOTT. It is far beyond my memory.

Representative DELANEY. Then I assume they have been here for a great number of years, is that right?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Yes, sir.

Representative DELANEY. And the fact they have been here and continued would indicate that it would be profitable to conduct a truck farm?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Yes.

Representative DELANEY. To produce local vegetables. Are there any truck farmers that own thousand-acre farms?

Mr. ELLIOTT. No.

Representative DELANEY. I understand from this record that thousand-acre farms and over—there are 114, is that right? (See exhibit 9a, table IV.)

Mr. ELLIOTT. That's right.

Representative DELANEY. And that all other farms, from 3 acres up to 999, I believe there are several thousand, is that right?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Yes, sir.

Representative DELANEY. There are 4,391. Notwithstanding that fact, those thousand-acre farms, 114 of them, include 2,394,372 acres as against a total acreage of 2,485,648, is that right?

Mr. ELLIOTT. That's true.

Representative DELANEY. And the farms over a thousand acres represent better than 95 percent plus of all the acreage on the island, do I understand that correctly?

Mr. ELLIOTT. That seems to be it.

Representative DELANEY. Well, that is the truth, isn't it?

Mr. ELLIOTT. That's the sense of the report. I assume that's correct.

Representative DELANEY. You assume it is correct. You know that?

Mr. ELLIOTT. As given in the census, it is the most reliable we have.

Representative DELANEY. In the absence of any other evidence you accept this, do you not?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I do.

Mr. LENNOX. Those big areas are primarily ranch lands, as I explained. The tillable lands, the small farms operated, represent about 7 or 8 percent of the total area in the Territory.

Representative MILLER. Not according to this figure. Those up to 99 acres, unless my additions are wrong, represent about 58,000 acres, or only about 2 percent of the farms.

Mr. LENNOX. Yes; but those—in this census you have included livestock, both dairy and beef cattle and poultry, and which operate on small areas. Then you have the big ranges which take care of the big block of the land area. Some of those are half a million acres.

Mr. ELLIOTT. All this acreage is not cultivated acreage.

Representative MILLER. That includes the big pineapple and sugar holdings, those 114?

Mr. LENNOX. Well—

Representative MILLER. It doesn't help the picture a whole lot.

Mr. LENNOX. Primarily those are ranch holdings.

Representative MILLER. Would that be broken down here later on?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Here's a further break-down you might be interested in of that acreage—712,000 is waste land.

Representative MILLER. What page is that on?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I am just giving that to you now.

Representative MILLER. According to this, roughly 100,000 acres, we will say, the 58,000 acre farms up to 100 acres, would most likely come out of the first category here, land used for crops, about 309,000 acres, leaving about only 250,000 acres for all the arable land used in the Territory; is that correct, outside of pasturage?

Mr. LENNOX. The arable land is this 309,000 acres, and of that nine-twelfths, I mean eleven-twelfths, of it is sugar and pineapples. That's the arable land.

Representative MILLER. Eleven-twelfths of that is—

Mr. LENNOX. Table land; yes.

Representative MILLER. I just want to make this statement in regard to the proposed bill of Mr. Farrington which he is setting up in this fishery research, I think it could be one of the things you could contribute to the economy of this Territory. There is a demand for fishery products, and there will be an increased demand for fishery products with the increased population on our mainland, where we are growing about a million in population a year—for these protein foods that are best supplied from that source. The Japanese exploited the fishery resources of the Territory that we assume will come under the jurisdiction of the United States. This is the logical place to center that activity, and I believe that the fisheries can make a substantial contribution to the economy, an economy needed here in these islands. And I think, Mr. Chairman, it would be well for this committee to examine Mr. Farrington's bill very carefully with the thought of urging a favorable report on it. I believe it's in the Agricultural Committee.

Delegate FARRINGTON. The Merchant Marine Fisheries Committee. Representative MILLER. Indicating to them the interest of this committee in that bill, in urging a favorable passage of the bill. That's quite important to the whole Pacific basis, and is, to my way of thinking, one of the bills that must be acted on and acted on immediately.

Chairman LARCADE. Very good statement. Thank you very much, Mr. Miller. Mr. Lennox, coming back to the sugarcane industry, all lands adapted to the growing of sugarcane, are they planted?

Mr. LENNOX. In sugarcane now?

Chairman LARCADE. Yes, all the lands adapted for the growing of sugarcane now? Are they being utilized for that purpose at this time?

Mr. LENNOX. I would say not. I can't give you the number of acres. It depends where the water could be developed to bring in additional acreage that is admirably suited for sugarcane production. Water is the limiting factor in some of them, steepness of terrain is the limiting factor of others, which were in sugar at one time.

Chairman LARCADE. That has to be irrigated, otherwise it will not be adapted to the expansion of the sugar industry?

Mr. LENNOX. That's right. There are lands which would have to be irrigated. If they could be irrigated it would make admirable lands. [See statement No. 29.]

Chairman LARCADE. You wouldn't have any idea as to the number of acres of such land that might be irrigated and be adapted to the growing of sugarcane?

Mr. LENNOX. No; I wouldn't.

Representative TAYLOR. Is there any expansion of the dairy industry in the islands?

Mr. LENNOX. An underexpansion, yes. An insufficient dairying industry is here right now.

Representative ANGELL. How wide is the ownership of the producing of pineapples and sugarcane?

Mr. LENNOX. I didn't understand your question.

Representative ANGELL. What is the spread of ownership in the production of sugarcane and pineapples?

Mr. LENNOX. Those are all corporations.

Representative ANGELL. How many are there, approximately?

Mr. LENNOX. I'd have to count them up. I think you could get that answer from the pineapple people that follow us here.

Delegate FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, amplifying your question about the potential sugar production of the Territory of Hawaii, I'd like to ask Mr. Lennox if he knows of any estimate as to the maximum to which the production of sugar might be extended in this Territory, providing the irrigation you mentioned, and other things, are provided or made available?

Mr. LENNOX. There is a continuous increase, there has been in recent years in production per acre through development of new varieties. That alone is an indication of where we might go, by using the present lands. We don't know where the ceiling is on that yet. There are also lands which are not in use, which may profitably be used with the change in development of new varieties for those lands. And then there is the possibility of developing new lands not now irrigated.

Delegate FARRINGTON. From a very practical standpoint, wouldn't it be reasonably correct to state that the production of sugar is not likely to exceed that of the million tons a year within the immediate future?

Mr. LENNOX. I don't think there is.

Delegate FARRINGTON. The fact that if we reach a million tons a year, we will be achieving an extraordinary advance?

Mr. LENNOX. Other breaks are coming in, such as the necessity for using mechanical equipment for harvesting and cultivating, which throws out certain lands formerly handled.

Delegate FARRINGTON. Isn't there great competition for good land?

Mr. LENNOX. Yes.

Delegate FARRINGTON. That people want to introduce other crops, and they would attempt to obtain the land for that purpose?

Chairman LARCADE. The purpose of my question was to ascertain the acreage. If I could find out the number of acres available for the sugar industry, I could compute what the sugar industry could do. Would you have anything to add to Mr. Lennox' testimony, Mr. Elliott?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Not a thing. I just came to explain these figures.

Chairman LARCADE. I think the time has come to take a recess, and we will resume hearings at 2 o'clock.

(Meeting adjourned at 12:20 p. m., until 2 p. m., January 8, 1946.)

AFTERNOON SESSION

Chairman LARCADE. The committee will come to order. The chairman of the committee has been directed by the committee to announce that the procedure will have to be revised if we are to complete the work that we have in mind here. Witnesses appearing with prepared statements or briefs are requested that instead of reading those briefs the same be filed for the record, and they will be requested to make such statements or comprehensive presentations as they desire, subject to being questioned by the members of the committee, and in that way it is anticipated that more progress will be made, and it may be very pertinent information may develop by questioning by the committee.

So, with that announcement, we will not proceed with the hearing, and I will call upon Judge Robertson to present the next witness.

Mr. ROBERTSON. We present now Dr. E. C. Auchter, director of the Pineapple Research Institute of the Territory.

Dr. Auchter, will you give us your background and qualifications?

Dr. E. C. AUCHTER. Mr. Chairman, I was born and raised in New York State, graduated from Cornell University, taught there for a time, and then conducted research in horticulture at West Virginia for a few years, at the University of West Virginia; then at the University of Maryland, where I was in charge of horticulture; then in 1928 I went to the Federal Government. I was in charge of horticulture, crops, and diseases for some 10 or 12 years. I then became Associate Chief of the Bureau of Plants and Industry there, and finally Chief of the Bureau of Plants and Industry. Just before coming here, for the past 4 years, I had been in charge of agricultural research for the United States Department of Agriculture at Washington. I am now president of the Pineapple Research Institute and vice president of the Pineapple Growers Association here in Hawaii.

Chairman LARCADE. You may proceed, sir. Have you a written statement, Mr. Auchter?

Dr. AUCHTER. I do, Mr. Chairman. I will be glad to present that to the secretary, and with your permission will discuss this industry briefly for 7 or 8 minutes. (Statement No. 4.)

Chairman LARCADE. Very fine.

Dr. AUCHTER. Both associations which I represent have passed a resolution favoring statehood. I thought you might be interested because this is one of the two large industries here in the islands, to hear just a little bit about its history and its development, the problems that it has had, its importance to the Nation and community, and how it has tried to take care of most of its own problems.

Pineapple growing in Hawaii started about 60 years ago on any large-size production. About 1885, just a few miles up from here, where the University of Hawaii is, in the Manoa Valley, Captain Kidwell planted a few acres of pineapples. He had a great many varieties and tested them, and he found this smooth Cayenne as one which seemed to be the best for these areas. You will be interested to know that by 1890 he was growing pineapples here at Pearl Harbor.

Now, at the turn of the century, pineapple development started at Wahiawa, just a few miles north of Pearl Harbor, and it is interesting to note that from a few acres in these 60 years the industry has grown now to approximately 62,000 acres, and from a few thousand cases of canned pineapples there are now some 18,000,000 cases shipped to the mainland; and from a few tons of pineapples something like 600,000 tons of pineapples are now grown.

Now, on this land we are very fortunate, in that pineapples seem to thrive and do well on land that is too dry for a great many crops. They will grow under 15, 16, 17, 18, or 20 inches of rainfall, conditions under which many crops will not do well. As you heard this morning, our water is not too plentiful, but this is a crop which can be grown in the uplands from 500 feet on up to around 1,400 or 1,500 feet elevation on those drier lands.

Now, in the development of this industry, there have been many problems, like other industries. Pests have come in, and threatened the industry. There was one of our pests known as the mealy bug, which threatened to wipe out this industry, through a disease known as the pineapple wilt. And the industry, recognizing the need for a thorough research, organized the research institute. Now, this research institute, and the companies in addition, conduct research for this industry, and there has been spent something like a million dollars, all by the industry. I want to emphasize that the industry did not go back to our Government and ask for aid on the various problems which developed here in production and canning. They are spending, and have spent around a million dollars yearly in this research. The mealy bug is a problem that was solved; and nematodes, which is an eel-like microscopic worm has been solved through research here, by soil fumigation and soil fertilization.

We explore in various parts of the world for plants which might be brought in here, for those which carried resistance there to the environmental conditions, or to the incidence of drought, or something else, and numbered selection programs have been conducted here by the institute and by the industry.

You would be interested to know that the industry developed what is known as the Ginaco machine, which pares, slices, and cores the pineapple and makes it ready for the can. Mulch paper was developed here, which is applied before the plants are planted to conserve moisture, prevent weeds, to regulate temperatures, and so on. It has been developed here by the industry. And I want to emphasize that the industry has done this through their own appropriations and funds to a great extent.

The pineapple has become an accepted food in our American diet. The armed forces, as you know, required practically two-thirds of our canned pineapples here in certain years, during the war. The other thing I wish to emphasize is that all through this war the pineapple industry here carried on under combat conditions. I don't know of any other canning industry that has done that, in the United States.

The canning industry employs about 10,000 people on their annual pay roll, people regularly employed—about 10,000, and they employ about 10,000 more seasonal workers. This is during the past year or two. Normally they would employ maybe 30 to 40 percent more, but during the war there has been this labor shortage. In addition, because of the people employed in the pineapple industry, a great many other people are employed here in the various industries in the islands, and in various institutions which the pineapple industry helps to support through taxes.

Wages in the pineapple industry are very favorable compared to any other American food industry, and in addition to paying high wages, perquisites, such as houses, medical care, and other things are received by the workers, furnished by the industry.

I want to just point out that a great many people are interested in the pineapple industry. There are a great many shareholders. One company, for instance, has 53,000 shareholders. Two other companies, and the divisions of mainland companies, mainland corporations have 15,000 and 28,000 shareholders, respectively. There is a great deal of business, not only here but in every State as a result of its movement in the channels of trade, in selling this crop and distributing it throughout the United States.

I mentioned that the industry paid what we think were very high wages, but in spite of these higher wages, and in spite of the higher cost of materials, the cans, packages, the fertilizers, spraying materials, and all the rest of that, there has been no price increase in pineapples since 1942 at the time of the regulation. Now, this has been done through efficient production practices as a result of research, through the mechanization of production machinery and canning machinery, and other better canning techniques. And all through the war, under the stress of conditions, I want to emphasize that through very excellent inspection by the industry, the quality of the pack has never fallen, and has never been questioned by the public or the armed services.

Now, in addition to those things which I have mentioned which the industry is contributing to the economy here in the islands, I would like just to mention two or three other things which the industry has contributed, and especially in connection with the war effort. We have furnished land, warehouses, machinery, repair of ships' motors. They have, in addition, grown other food crops during the war.

There was a certain amount of potatoes, a certain amount of vegetables, and they increased their meat production. As you know, one of the companies produced a lot of candy for the armed forces. I just heard this yesterday, and I think you would be interested in it, and that is when the boys went in—the marines—went into Iwo Jima, each was given a cellophane bag in which there was gum, candies, cigarettes, and matches, and all of these cellophane bags were made here by the pineapple industry. They were really assault rations.

Now I would like just to summarize like this: On the whole we believe our industry has reason for pride in its war job, as well as in the way in which it has served the consumers of America, and in the manner in which it has contributed to the economic and social progress of the Territory. The statistical data on the industry has been submitted for your record. [See exhibits 8a and b, and 11h.] That I will submit to you. We are hopeful that while you are in Hawaii you will have an opportunity to see its operations first-hand.

Chairman LARCADE. Thank you. Would you mind answering a few questions?

Dr. AUCHTER. I would be glad to.

Chairman LARCADE. What is the character of the labor employed in the pineapple industry?

Dr. AUCHTER. You mean by racial groups?

Chairman LARCADE. Yes.

Dr. AUCHTER. There are Japanese, people of Japanese racial extraction, Chinese, Hawaiian, Puerto Ricans, and naturally part-Hawaiians.

Chairman LARCADE. And they all get along together without any trouble?

Dr. AUCHTER. Yes.

Chairman LARCADE. You haven't had any trouble?

Dr. AUCHTER. We have had relatively little trouble.

Chairman LARCADE. Any other questions?

Representative DELANEY. You stated that the workers in this industry receive very high wages. Will you tell us what the average wage of a worker is annually in the pineapple industry?

Dr. AUCHTER. I will give it to you this way, sir, because I have those figures—

Representative DELANEY. Are you able to tell us what the average annual wage is of the pineapple worker in Hawaii?

Dr. AUCHTER. I do not have that figure by the year, but I have the average wage per hour, sir. I do not right here. I can get it for the year for you, sir.

Representative DELANEY. I would appreciate it, Doctor, if you could. Now, on the island of Lanai, I understand that that island is wholly owned by the Hawaiian Pineapple Co. What opportunity has been given to the workers to establish home sites there?

Dr. AUCHTER. I am not really prepared to answer that question.

Representative DELANEY. Well, I understand, Doctor, that you are a representative of the Pineapple Growers Association, is that right?

Dr. AUCHTER. Yes.

Representative DELANEY. Can you give us any information on the available land, or what property there is made available for workers on that particular island?

Dr. AUCHTER. As you know, villages have been built, homes built for the people there. Now, how much they have requested for their own——

Representative DELANEY. All right, Doctor, the fee of the land, then, is in control of this one company, is that right?

Dr. AUCHTER. I believe it is, sir.

Representative DELANEY. You know that is right, don't you?

Dr. AUCHTER. Well——

Representative DELANEY. That is a very simple question, Doctor, you know that is right.

Dr. AUCHTER. I haven't just read this whole thing, but I assume it is right.

Representative DELANEY. You are testifying here as an expert and as a representative, I understand, of the Pineapple Growers Association. That would seem to me to be a comparatively simple question.

Dr. AUCHTER. Well, if they own the whole land, then it is theirs in fee simple.

Representative DELANEY. You know that to be a fact, don't you?

Dr. AUCHTER. I think that is a fact. I have not seen the papers, sir, of the purchase, but I think that is a fact.

Representative DELANEY. That's all.

Chairman LARCADE. Any other questions?

Representative TAYLOR. How does the wage scale compare with those men who are employed in producing sugar?

Dr. AUCHTER. I am afraid I couldn't answer that, because I do not know the wage scale paid to the sugar worker.

Representative TAYLOR. What is the prevailing wage scale for ordinary labor in the pineapple plantations? Have you that?

Dr. AUCHTER. Yes. The average wages in cents per hour in the Honolulu canneries here, or on the plantation, is 69.9 per hour for male labor.

Representative TAYLOR. Do you recall what it was in 1940?

Dr. AUCHTER. I couldn't give you 1940, but it was the figure up here at the time of the last hearing here.

Representative TAYLOR. That was in 1937?

Dr. AUCHTER. 1937. I can give you that, 32 cents on the plantations.

Representative ANGELL. What is it in the canneries?

Dr. AUCHTER. In canneries, which is now, in the Honolulu canneries, 94¾ cents per hour. Canneries on the islands other than here on this island, 79¾ cents per hour. That was in—do you wish that information?

Representative ANGELL. Yes.

Dr. AUCHTER. In 1937, at the last hearing, urban canneries, 42½; rural canneries, 35.6.

Representative ANGELL. What proportion of the year do they work on the pay roll?

Dr. AUCHTER. Well, the great bulk of that, I should say, is through the heavy season, in July, August, and September. Now, they do work, many of them, right through the year, there is a certain amount of work, but the big peak is in July and August. [Exhibit 79B.]

Representative ANGELL. Is there a differential between the male and female workers?

Dr. AUCHTER. Yes. I have it for the female, if you wish it.

Representative ANGELL. What is it, lower?

Dr. AUCHTER. It is lower, if you wish the figure.

Representative ANGELL. Yes. You have the figures there?

Dr. AUCHTER. In the Honolulu canneries the male figure is 94¾ cents; the female average is 69.6 cents. On the islands other than Oahu, 79¾ cents per male; and 62.1 for female. On the plantations 69.94 for male, average; 55 average for female.

Representative ANGELL. On the plantations do they get living quarters in addition to that?

Dr. AUCHTER. Yes. The house is furnished on the plantations, light, water, medical service is furnished.

Representative ANGELL. That's all, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman LARCADE. Any other questions? Mr. Farrington?

Delegate FARRINGTON. The Pineapple Growers Association adopted a resolution supporting immediate statehood for Hawaii?

Dr. AUCHTER. Yes.

Delegate FARRINGTON. Your work has been principally in the scientific field?

Dr. AUCHTER. That is right, yes.

Delegate FARRINGTON. As I understand, you are a scientist by training, the direction of the pineapple research, and the purpose of your testimony is to support the contention that the economic development of the Territory is such that it is perfectly capable of assuming the responsibility of statehood, so far as economic development is concerned?

Dr. AUCHTER. That is right, sir.

Delegate FARRINGTON. You supplement what you said orally with exhibits covering land tenure and utilization, if this is pertinent, as well as wage rates—I assume that is part of your exhibit—on the development of the pineapple industry?

Dr. AUCHTER. Right.

Delegate FARRINGTON. You have the data to support your statement that the wages paid in the pineapple industry are comparable to those paid in other fruit-growing industries in the country?

Dr. AUCHTER. I think so, yes. [Exhibit 79A.]

Delegate FARRINGTON. That's all.

Chairman LARCADE. Thank you very much, sir.

(Dr. Auchter was thereupon excused and withdrew.)

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, we present Mr. Henry A. White, president of the Hawaiian Pineapple Co., who would be glad to answer Mr. Delaney's question.

Chairman LARCADE. Would you give us your title?

Mr. HENRY A. WHITE. I am president of the Hawaiian Pineapple Co., and have been since 1941. I was born and raised here, educated in the Territory, and have been in both the sugar and the pineapple business.

Chairman LARCADE. Thank you. You may be seated, and proceed.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Would you answer Mr. Delaney, Mr. White?

Representative DELANEY. He hasn't testified to anything yet?

Chairman LARCADE. Would you make any general statement that you would like to make after hearing the discussion that has ensued?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Delaney asked Doctor Auchter a question as to the

land set up on the island of Lanai. I would be very happy to answer any questions that he has. The land on Lanai is owned almost in its entirety by the Hawaiian Pineapple Co., with the exception of a few Kuleanas that still remain that are owned by old Hawaiian families. The island was developed entirely by the Pineapple Co. It was a cattle-shipping ranch in the old days. There is a very extensive road system on the island, which was put in entirely at the expense of the Hawaiian Pineapple Co. The port of Kaunapali was developed at the expense of the Pineapple Co.; a breakwater installed. What is known as Lanai City, where all the employees live, was developed by the Pineapple Co. The houses were furnished; water developed; power furnished; and all facilities are owned and controlled by the Pineapple Co., with the exception of a few areas that had been conveyed to the Territorial government for school purposes, and to the county government for roads, police station facilities, and that type of thing.

Chairman LARCADE. Mr. Delaney.

Representative DELANEY. When a worker lives on the island, and for some reason he disengages his services in the Hawaiian Pineapple Co., that means that he has no opportunity to purchase land, is that right?

Mr. WHITE. That is correct.

Representative DELANEY. That's all.

Mr. WHITE. There would not be any land that could be profitably operated, other than the land that is under cultivation. There are no facilities available over there. There is no water over there available, other than what the company has developed.

Representative DELANEY. In your stockholders' set up, without getting off this subject too much, I understand that there are a great many stockholders in this particular company. How few have 51 percent of stock?

Mr. WHITE. How few?

Representative DELANEY. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. There are two corporations that control—two corporations, or, rather, the aggregate of two corporations represents more than control of the stock.

Representative DELANEY. More than 51 percent of the stock?

Mr. WHITE. That is correct.

Representative DELANEY. There are a great many others, thousands of other stockholders?

Mr. WHITE. There are about 5,300 stockholders altogether.

Representative DELANEY. No further questions.

Chairman LARCADE. Is the land of the island peculiarly or solely adapted to the cultivation of and growing of pineapples?

Mr. WHITE. Well, of course, the bulk of the land is waste land. A lot of it is in forest reserve, but a lot of it is waste. Some of it is fair grade pasture land, and some of it very poor pasture land.

Chairman LARCADE. Would it be adapted to the growing of sugarcane?

Mr. WHITE. No. You could not grow sugarcane. There is no water available over there to grow sugarcane. The water reserve on the island of Lanai would never support a sugarcane plantation, and the rainfall is not adequate to operate it as an unirrigated plantation.

Chairman LARCADE. Thank you. Any other questions by members of the committee?

Representative ANGELL. What was the production on the island prior to the time of this development by your company?

Mr. WHITE. The production on the land of Lanai? It was simply a cattle ranch.

Representative ANGELL. Quite limited, I presume, in the production of useful products?

Mr. WHITE. Very limited. Very limited, because it does not have an adequate rainfall to support it.

Representative ANGELL. What is the value of the product now produced on the island by your company?

Mr. WHITE. That would be pretty difficult to answer. I mean, it would depend upon how you wanted to express it. The production of the island would probably run anywhere from 150,000 to 180,000 tons of pineapple per annum, dependent upon your rainfall during the period.

Representative ANGELL. What percentage is that of the total production of pineapple?

Mr. WHITE. Well, it represents about 60 percent of our production, and our production is about 50 percent of the production of the industry.

Representative ANGELL. So your development on the island has resulted in producing that much useful product for the benefit of the Territory?

Mr. WHITE. For the benefit of the Territory. And further than that, it has very substantially increased the value of the lands for tax purposes. In other words, it has gone from a value of a little or nothing per acre—maybe \$2 or \$3 per acre—up to \$100, \$150, or \$200 per acre for tax purposes.

Representative ANGELL. Are these workmen on the plantation there, and also in your canneries, receiving as much or more than their income was prior to the time that you had this development?

Mr. WHITE. Well, I don't think that you can really compare them, because the island at the time was operated as a cattle ranch, and probably the extent of the population was a bunch of cowboys.

Representative ANGELL. I assume that your workers come from the other islands; do your operations raise their total income, do you think, from what it was before?

Mr. WHITE. Well, you don't have the same work as there, but the standard, I would say—

Representative ANGELL. The standard of living?

Mr. WHITE. I would say that the standards are higher than they were before.

Representative ANGELL. I believe that's all, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman LARCADE. Are there any further questions? Thank you very much, sir.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I would like to ask Mr. White if he could tell the committee what proportion of the island of Lanai is cultivated in pineapples?

Mr. WHITE. Well, out of the total area of the island of Lanai, which is about 90,000 acres, about roughly 15,000 acres are devoted to pineapple cultivation, and used in connection with pineapple cultivation.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The rest of the island is forest reserve and waste and grass land?

Mr. WHITE. Forest reserve, waste, and grass land.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Does your company make use of the grass land?

Mr. WHITE. Yes. We run about 3,000 head of cattle over there, to furnish beef for the use of our employees, and in addition operate a piggery over there to supply the pork needs of the community, and during the war produced all of the vegetables that were needed for our employees over there.

Chairman LARCADE. Any further questions?

Mr. ROBERTSON. No.

Chairman LARCADE. Thank you very much.

(Mr. White at this time was excused and withdrew.)

Mr. ROBERTSON. We present Mr. Chauncey B. Wightman, secretary of the Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association.

Mr. CHAUNCEY B. WIGHTMAN. My name is Chauncey B. Wightman. I am secretary of the Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association. I was born in South Dakota, and spent most of my boyhood in Oregon. After that I was several years in South America, and subsequently with the Department of Agriculture. I was with the Secretary of Agriculture in the sugar legislation in 1936, which was declared unconstitutional. I joined the Sugar Planters' Association at that time.

Chairman LARCADE. You may proceed.

Representative ANGELL. I am not going to hold it against you for leaving Oregon.

Mr. WIGHTMAN. The greener hills are always further and yon.

Chairman LARCADE. I see that you have a brief there. The committee would be very glad if you would file the brief that you have prepared, sir. [Statement No. 5.]

Mr. WIGHTMAN. As a matter of fact, there are two documents, one for a resolution which was adopted by the trustees of the association of which I am secretary. I would like to have an opportunity to file that. The other document relates to the contribution of the sugar industry in getting ready for war. This also contains a résumé of the activities of the community; the blood bank; office of civilian defense; the major disaster council, and the medical group, which was combined in this one document to show what the community had done. It was intended to be presented at the joint congressional committee, but I understand that they are getting pretty far afield, and are not particularly interested. But I think it is something that would be worth while, because it does bear directly on the subject of qualification for statehood.

Chairman LARCADE. We would be very glad to have you file these papers in the record. [Exhibits 28 (a), (b), 29, 30 (a), (b).]

Mr. WIGHTMAN. I think it would probably be well first to explain what the Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association is. It is an organization, now 50 years old, and perhaps does not have any parallel on the mainland, with the possible exception of the Citrus Growers' Association of California, a somewhat similar organization.

This organization has, as its bylaws, the following:

This association shall be known as the Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association and shall have for its objects and purposes the maintenance, advancement, improvement, and protection of the sugar industry of Hawaii, the support of an experiment station, the maintenance of a sufficient supply of labor for the sugar

plantations of Hawaii, and the development of agriculture in general, and the doing of all such matters and things as shall be incidental to said purposes and objects or any of them.

This article remains as originally adopted.

Chairman LARCADE. Pardon me for interrupting you a moment. Speak to the microphone so that all can hear you. And I will ask the members, in asking their questions, to please speak louder. The people in the back of the room are unable to hear.

Mr. WIGHTMAN. The sugar industry was founded over 100 years ago. It went through the tribulations of any pioneer industry. Coming along with the Territory when it was a kingdom, it suffered all the vicissitudes that are known to man. Production has increased slowly and steadily over a period of years, until the peak production in 1933, producing approximately 1,100,000 tons of sugar.

Chairman LARCADE. How much, sir?

Mr. WIGHTMAN. One million, a hundred thousand. Since that time, because of restriction through the Jones-Costigan Act on sugar in 1937, production has decreased somewhat. There has been a particularly marked decrease since the war started—I think perhaps you would be interested in a copy of this chart here—in 1936 we produced 1,146,000 tons of sugar. It held up pretty well until 1940, when we began to get in-roads on our labor from defense projects, and has been sliding down until it fell to 820,000 tons now, the lowest since 1927. You will notice that the number of adult male employees has decreased, particularly since 1940. The reason we have been able to maintain production is due to improved cane varieties and increased mechanization. I might add, in connection with the cane varieties, we sent a number of recently developed varieties down to the experiment station in Louisiana; that would accrue to your benefit, too.

I assume some of you are interested in the wages and make-up of the plantations. At the present time, as you notice in this chart, there are 20,209 adult unskilled male employees on the plantation. That has gone off steadily since the war, which terminated in August. We have lost, since the war, some 200. The prospects of increased production is pretty small, unless we get more labor.

Now, I will turn to the matter of the make-up, the citizenship, and the racial descent of employees in the plantations. There are 28,000 people presently employed on the plantation. Of that group approximately 14,000 are citizens, and 14,000 are noncitizens. Of these noncitizens, 9,000—almost 10,000, are Filipinos, who unless they served in the armed services cannot become citizens of the United States. There are 5,000 citizens of Japanese ancestry; 3,000 are noncitizens, as they were born in Japan and are not eligible for citizenship.

The plantation community, on the whole, lives harmoniously. As yet we have had no manifestation of any racial strife. We hope that that will not come to pass.

I had not come prepared with a general statement, but I assume some of you gentlemen are going to ask questions.

Chairman LARCADE. I think that is very good. Of course, you know I come from Louisiana, which is the largest sugar producing State in the United States. As you know, too, the Sugar Act comes up for renewal this year, and we are more or less interested in the question of the production in Cuba. I was wondering if you would

be able to tell me whether there are prospects of the expansion of the sugar industry. [See Statement No. 29.]

Mr. WIGHTMAN. You have, of course, the physical limitation of suitable land. At the peak we cultivated about 250,000 acres of land. It is now down to 216,000 acres.

Chairman LARCADE. Will you repeat that?

Mr. WIGHTMAN. We had a peak production of sugar on 250,000 acres. Presently we have 216,000.

Delegate FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I suggest that we suspend the proceedings until we get the loud speaking system in operation.

Mr. WIGHTMAN. I think it is dead.

Delegate FARRINGTON. It is not in proper operating order. Either it is on or off. I don't know just who is operating it.

Chairman LARCADE. We will suspend for a few moments.

(Brief recess.)

Mr. WIGHTMAN. As to the prospective increase in production, it depends almost entirely upon manpower and improved cane varieties. How much further we can go with improved cane varieties we do not know. The scientists at the experiment station are conducting experiments to increase the improved cane varieties.

Chairman LARCADE. But is all the land adapted to the growing of sugar being utilized?

Mr. WIGHTMAN. All that is economically adapted to the growing of sugarcane; yes. There has been an inclination in the last few years, particularly, to go to the more highly productive land, but there is a serious question in the minds of many as to how much further we can go in sugar production. I would not venture to guess how far we could go, beyond, say, a million tons. Maybe it would be 1,100,000 tons again. It depends entirely on the circumstances.

Chairman LARCADE. Thank you, sir. Does any other member of the committee have any questions?

Representative TAYLOR. Yes, I would like to ask one or two.

Chairman LARCADE. Mr. Taylor.

Representative TAYLOR. How does the basic wage scale on the sugar plantations compare with the wage scale of those who are employed on the pineapple plantations?

Mr. WIGHTMAN. Those who are working the year around are pretty much the same. After all, there is a severe shortage of labor here. They are competing for labor, and so are we. We want to get our crop off, and they want to get their crop off. So on the year-around basis the wage scale is pretty much the same. However, they have a season when they have to harvest pineapples, and during those periods, I believe, generally speaking, their wage scale is over that of the sugar industry.

Representative TAYLOR. Would you say that the difference was lower than 59.4 for male labor, male help?

Mr. WIGHTMAN. 59.4 cents per hour?

Representative TAYLOR. Yes. What is the basic wage?

Mr. WIGHTMAN. The average earnings for the last 4 months—the average daily earnings do not include the value of perquisites—it is \$5.11 per 8-hour day.

I might say that we are operating under a determination issued by the Secretary of Agriculture, requiring the payment of minimum wages, also under Territorial minimum wage laws, and so on.

Representative TAYLOR. Your workers are unionized?

Mr. WIGHTMAN. Yes. They are unionized about 100 percent in the mill and the shops, and in the course of being unionized in the fields.

Chairman LARCADE. Any further questions?

Representative DELANEY. What proportion of the entire industry of the Territory does the sugar industry represent?

Mr. WIGHTMAN. Is that with respect to the number of people employed?

Representative DELANEY. Approximately.

Mr. WIGHTMAN. Well, before the war—we have to go back before the war, if you are drawing a comparison—I would say, along about 1935 and 1936, approximately half of the working population was employed in the sugar industry.

Representative DELANEY. In your testimony, you referred to adult workers.

Mr. WIGHTMAN. Yes.

Representative DELANEY. Have you any minors working in the field?

Mr. WIGHTMAN. Yes; but, of course, we do not employ them below 14 years of age, as required by regulations. For the most part they are school children.

Representative DELANEY. Will you tell us briefly how many hours a day do these school children work?

Mr. WIGHTMAN. Not more than 8, for children between the ages of 14 to 16.

Representative DELANEY. How many hours a day?

Mr. WIGHTMAN. Not more than 8 hours a day.

Representative DELANEY. What is the salary of these workers?

Mr. WIGHTMAN. Forty cents an hour.

Representative DELANEY. Do I undersand that your industry is subsidized by the government?

Mr. WIGHTMAN. We receive, like any other sugar producer, payments under the Sugar Act of 1937.

Representative DELANEY. Approximately how much does the sugar industry of Hawaii receive from the United States Government, on an average for the last 5 years?

Mr. WIGHTMAN. It would run about \$8 a ton.

Representative DELANEY. \$8 a ton.

Mr. WIGHTMAN. Under the Sugar Act of 1937, that would run six or seven million dollars. I wouldn't say that is a subsidy, by any means. That is not considered a subsidy by Congress itself in the adopting of the Sugar Act of 1937.

Representative DELANEY. All right. We will get to that. In the course of your business, do you offer your shipping by open-bidding process?

Mr. WIGHTMAN. Sugar is transported between here and the mainland by Matson, Ismthmian Line, and a variety of shippers.

Representative DELANEY. Now, are the directors of those companies you mentioned intermingled?

Mr. WIGHTMAN. There are 14,000 stockholders. In some cases there are identical officers in some plantations.

Representative DELANEY. What about the shipping industry?

Mr. WIGHTMAN. There are naturally some people interested in sugar and interested in shipping.

Representative DELANEY. In the shipping and in the growing?

Mr. WIGHTMAN. Yes.

Representative DELANEY. Then I understand that you have factors?

Mr. WIGHTMAN. Pardon?

Representative DELANEY. You have factors to handle your sugar?

Mr. WIGHTMAN. You are leading up to the so-called five families, is that it?

Representative DELANEY. I think I will make myself clear what I am leading up to, if I am left alone. I don't want to take too much time. We have heard a lot about a monopoly here. In your opinion does a monopoly exist?

Mr. WIGHTMAN. It does not.

Representative DELANEY. There is no monopoly?

Mr. WIGHTMAN. There is no monopoly here.

Representative DELANEY. Have you any price-fixing regulations?

Mr. WIGHTMAN. The OPA, yes.

Representative DELANEY. Not as between yourselves?

Mr. WIGHTMAN. Sugar competes in the open market and is subject to OPA ceiling prices.

Representative DELANEY. What machinery do you use for processing your sugar?

Mr. WIGHTMAN. What machinery do we use?

Representative DELANEY. Yes.

Mr. WIGHTMAN. You mean the physical processing, making it into raw sugar?

Representative DELANEY. Yes.

Mr. WIGHTMAN. We use machinery that is made by a variety of firms, some made here, some made on the mainland.

Representative DELANEY. Is that machinery owned by the sugar corporation?

Mr. WIGHTMAN. You are referring to the mill?

Representative DELANEY. Yes.

Mr. WIGHTMAN. Yes. It is owned by the corporation.

Representative DELANEY. Is that rented from any one under an agreement?

Chairman LARCADE. Leased.

Representative DELANEY. Leased.

Mr. WIGHTMAN. No. In some cases the land may be leased on which the mill is located.

Representative DELANEY. How many companies manufacture the machinery used in processing?

Mr. WIGHTMAN. I would say hundreds of them.

Representative DELANEY. How many are popularly used on this island?

Mr. WIGHTMAN. You are referring to the number of mills on the island?

Representative DELANEY. No. I am referring to the number of machines used for processing on this island.

Mr. WIGHTMAN. Let me get this straight. We have sugar mills here. There are rollers; the juice is squeezed out; it goes to the boilers and the rest of the processing. Are you referring to how many manufacturers there are of those different types of machinery?

Representative DELANEY. That's right.

Mr. WIGHTMAN. Well, I don't know how many there are. There are a variety. There are a large number in the city.

Representative DELANEY. Is there any machinery used here in the processing of sugar that is owned or controlled or leased from companies with directors who are intermingled with the production of sugar?

Mr. WIGHTMAN. I wouldn't know.

Representative DELANEY. To your knowledge.

Mr. WIGHTMAN. I don't know what you are leading up to, but I don't know of any. No. There are firms that manufacture, repair, and service machinery, in which I imagine many people in this room are interested in a practical and financial way.

Representative DELANEY. Can you tell me what the average salary of the plantation worker is; that is, those who work as laborers in the field?

Mr. WIGHTMAN. Well, this is the best I can give you: \$5.11 is the average daily cash earnings of an unskilled adult employee.

Representative DELANEY. What about the average salary of the factory worker?

Mr. WIGHTMAN. They run pretty much the same as they do in the field. We have to keep those two operations pretty much in balance. If you make the factory wage scale too far ahead of the field, the field workers get discontented. If you make the wage scale in the field ahead of the factory's, the factory workers are dissatisfied. They balance out over a period of time.

Representative DELANEY. How many are there in the group of factors?

Mr. WIGHTMAN. There are seven plantations on this island.

Representative DELANEY. How many factors represent those seven?

Mr. WIGHTMAN. You are referring to the agencies which represent the various plantations on this island?

Representative DELANEY. That's right.

Mr. WIGHTMAN. There are four on this particular island of Oahu. That is what you are talking about?

Representative DELANEY. Yes. Now, are the directors and stockholders of the factor corporation and the plantation corporations intermingled?

Mr. WIGHTMAN. In some cases; yes.

Representative DELANEY. In a great many cases, is that not so?

Mr. WIGHTMAN. I couldn't answer that, whether they are or not. There are 14,000 stockholders in the plantations themselves. What you are coming back to is the so-called Big Five, isn't that it?

Representative DELANEY. Exactly. Now, if you can clear up that situation and tell me: Is there any one group that controls the majority of the stock in any of these plantations that you spoke of here on the island?

Mr. WIGHTMAN. In some cases there are some of the agencies that do own the majority of stock in the individual plantations. In other

cases they do not. The situation is widely diversified. The reason for that is a very simple one, they need the financing of the agencies to help in the financing of these individual companies. You see, that started back in the days when there was very little communication available. Everything came to Honolulu. This was only taken care of coming to Honolulu. Nothing outside. Ships stopped for orders, and they would go out. They worked through these agencies. The agencies would attend to the shipping; they financed them through hard times—and they would have a lot of them, too. That, roughly, is the history of the agencies. There are other instances where the agencies have contributed materially to the tiding of these plantations over hard times.

Representative DELANEY. Is there any agreement between the plantation owners to work through the factors that you mentioned; any agreement to retain those factors as their agent?

Mr. WIGHTMAN. No. But I assume there probably would be a contract between the plantation and the agency; however, they are free to come and go as they wish. For instance, there are five plantation companies here which have the majority of stockholders in California. They are incorporated in California. They have one of the agencies represent them, but they are free to come and go, or choose someone else, as they wish.

Representative DELANEY. How long have you been associated with the sugar industry?

Mr. WIGHTMAN. Since 1937.

Representative DELANEY. Since 1937 have you used any factor other than these four that were mentioned?

Mr. WIGHTMAN. On this island?

Representative DELANEY. Yes.

Mr. WIGHTMAN. Well, in dealing with the individual companies they happen to represent the sugar plantations on this particular island.

Representative DELANEY. There were four main factors, is that right?

Mr. WIGHTMAN. No. Now you are coming back to the so-called Five. There are five agencies representing 34 sugar plantations. They represent them only for the purpose of operation. They do not always have financial control of these plantations.

Representative DELANEY. But in some cases they do?

Mr. WIGHTMAN. In some cases they do, but that is a minority rather than a majority.

Representative DELANEY. What about the factors and the steamship companies, are those stockholders and directors intermingled?

Mr. WIGHTMAN. In some cases. You are referring to the agencies?

Representative DELANEY. That's right.

Mr. WIGHTMAN. In some cases. I am not sure as to that but generally speaking. How big a block of stock each agency has, I don't know.

Representative DELANEY. Would you say in words and substance that they are substantial in number?

Mr. WIGHTMAN. I am in no position to know.

Representative DELANEY. You are in no position to know?

Mr. WIGHTMAN. No. That is shipping. You are going to have someone else up here later on in connection with shipping. That is out of my province.

Representative DELANEY. All right, sir.

Chairman LARCADE. Is that all? Are there any further questions?

Delegate FARRINGTON. I would like to ask if you have the figures showing what proportion of the sugar employees own their own homes?

Mr. WIGHTMAN. No. I do not have that.

Delegate FARRINGTON. Is it possible to supply the committee with those figures? [See exhibit No. 93.]

Mr. WIGHTMAN. Yes. I think, generally speaking, that is relatively small; very, very small, as a matter of fact. The history of that is when the sugar industry started in Hawaii, there was little labor available, so we had to go further afield to obtain a sufficient supply of labor. As in other industries that utilize one type of labor, we cast about in the Azores, Germany, Europe, and gradually turned toward the Orient, picking up labor from China, Japan, and the Philippines. It was the custom among this labor to work for 3 years and then return, so that in the past there was always a shifting labor turn-over. That has been the history up to 1932, when the Tydings-McDuffie Act went into effect. Since that time there has been no immigration here, except recently, there was an order issued by the Governor for the importation of 6,000 Filipinos to relieve the present acute shortage.

Chairman LARCADE. Have you been using prisoner-of-war labor?

Mr. WIGHTMAN. We applied for prisoner-of-war labor, but the army wanted them, so they could not give us any. As a matter of fact, they have been raiding our plantations for labor continually, and we are in no position to compete with the United States Army for labor.

Representative ANGELL. You didn't connect up that labor with the house proposition, home ownership.

Mr. WIGHTMAN. I was going to say that in the past, up to 1934, there were always a certain number who would be here 3 years, and then they would be going back. That is the history. Now perhaps times will change.

Representative ANGELL. Did the company provide houses for them?

Mr. WIGHTMAN. The company provided houses for them the year around; employment, together with perquisites.

Representative ANGELL. So it was not practicable for them to own their own homes?

Mr. WIGHTMAN. It was not in the past. We don't know what the future holds. As a matter of fact, we are now in the process of studying this whole question. You see, our organization is run pretty much as Congress is, with a series of committees. The committee is now going into that problem. It is a very grave problem, and there are a lot of difficulties. After all, when you have carried on a practice for a hundred years, it is quite a wrench to make a change, and careful study is necessary before taking any steps.

Representative MILLER. You have mentioned these cash wages as \$5.11 per day.

Mr. WIGHTMAN. Yes.

Representative MILLER. And rather implied other considerations. What are those other considerations that were given?

Mr. WIGHTMAN. In addition to that—I am glad that you brought that up, sir—in addition to that we furnish perquisites. The plantations furnish perquisites in the form of housing, light, fuel, medical care for themselves and their immediate family.

Representative MILLER. Those are all in addition?

Mr. WIGHTMAN. Yes. That is in addition to the average cash pay.

Representative MILLER. There is no charge for the house?

Mr. WIGHTMAN. That is in addition to the cash wage I stated.

Representative MILLER. No charge for the house, deduction of the rental?

Mr. WIGHTMAN. No. Of course, there has been some discussion as to the value, whether it would be the value or the cost. We are now involved in a discussion with the various departments, including the Department of Labor, as to whether it would be value, or whether it would be cost. The last ruling we had from one department, I think the Social Security, was that they evaluated that at \$11 a month. They graded according to families, and whether they were skilled or unskilled. We have also used the figure of 6 cents an hour for the cost.

Representative MILLER. There is no deduction from the salary or wages for the use of this house?

Mr. WIGHTMAN. No. We operate the other way around. We should add it on there.

Representative MILLER. You maintain company stores?

Mr. WIGHTMAN. We maintain company stores, which are also in competition with private stores.

Representative MILLER. They are not required to purchase from those company stores?

Mr. WIGHTMAN. In some villages there are private stores, more often than not, which are competing with the company stores.

Representative MILLER. They are free to use those private stores?

Mr. WIGHTMAN. Yes; they do.

Representative MILLER. Has that always been the case in this industry?

Mr. WIGHTMAN. In the majority of cases, yes. Of course, as a rule, the plantation stores are lower in price than the competitive stores, because they usually operate on a larger volume.

Representative MILLER. Then the competitive stores would not last very long.

Mr. WIGHTMAN. There are a lot of them around, and they do last pretty well—

Representative DELANEY. Well, this land would be owned, in most cases, by the plantation owners, isn't that right?

Mr. WIGHTMAN (continuing). As you will see when you go around the plantation.

Representative DELANEY. The competitive stores would have to rent the land and premises?

Mr. WIGHTMAN. Not necessarily, no. But in many cases.

Representative DELANEY. Well, that would be true on one of the other islands that was wholly controlled by the planters?

Mr. WIGHTMAN. The plantation does not control all the land.

Representative DELANEY. Just one more question. I don't want to take too much time. You mentioned the daily salary. Can you tell us the average yearly salary of the man who works in the field?

Mr. WIGHTMAN. Yes. I can work that out and give it to you. It is just a matter of finding out the average number of days. [See exhibit No. 94.]

Representative DELANEY. That is the yearly salary.

Representative MILLER. The average take-home monthly pay.

Mr. WIGHTMAN. Yes. I can get that.

Chairman LARCADE. Are there any further questions?

Representative MILLER. \$5.11 a day for only 60 days in the year does not amount to very much money.

Mr. WIGHTMAN. Oh, there is work available for them every day of the week, if they want to work that way, particularly in the field.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The question was asked whether the plantation deducts anything from the cash wages of the laborer for house rent.

Mr. WIGHTMAN. Under the terms of the Fair Labor Standards Act it works the other way around. You start from the top and work down. The minimum cash wage is \$5.11, plus the value of perquisites. Now, there are some cases with the people who are earning minimum wages, for instance, under the Territorial wage-and-hour law, that would be 40 cents, less the value of perquisites, nominally fixed at 6 cents.

Representative MILLER. Then his take-home pay would be 34 cents an hour?

Mr. WIGHTMAN. That is correct.

Representative MILLER. So this \$5.11——

Mr. WIGHTMAN. No. That is \$5.11.

Representative MILLER. That is something else. I thought it could be answered by yes or no.

Mr. WIGHTMAN. \$5.11 is cash. That is take-home pay.

Representative MILLER. Then it could be answered by "no."

Mr. WIGHTMAN. There is nothing deducted.

Representative MILLER. When I asked you a question you went into rambling around the barn, when it could be answered "yes" or "no."

Mr. WIGHTMAN. The Government brought that on us.

Representative MILLER. I was not interested in what the Government was doing. I was asking a fair question.

Mr. WIGHTMAN. \$5.11.

Representative MILLER. I was confused. I am confused now. I am not quite certain.

Mr. WIGHTMAN. \$5.11 is cash.

Representative MILLER. I don't know what the answer is.

Mr. WIGHTMAN. Well, the answer is \$5.11 cash, average cash earnings for an 8-hour day.

Representative MILLER. No deductions of any sort from that?

Mr. WIGHTMAN. No.

Representative MILLER. Except social security, taxes, or something like that?

Chairman LARCADE. I would suggest that Mr. Wightman file a brief on that.

In deference to the reporter, we will now take a 10-minute recess.

(At this time Mr. Wightman was excused and withdrew.)

(A recess was taken until 3:15 p. m.)

(Representative Delaney acting chairman, in place of Representative Larcade.)

(Recess to 3:30 p. m.)

AFTER RECESS

Chairman DELANEY. Please come to order. Judge Robertson, will you present the next witness?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes, Mr. Chairman. First I would like to file two things. One is in reply to a question that was asked yesterday, I think, in regard to the number of persons rejected in the selective-service operations here for illiteracy. The reply comes from Maj. Lake E. Bellinger, AUS, deputy director of the territorial headquarters, Selective Service System. I might say that this letter shows these figures: Total registrants examined on Oahu in 1945, 17,280; total rejected for all reasons, mental and physical, 2,560. Total registrants accepted, 14,720.

Then there is a further figure in this letter comparing rejections in Hawaii with rejections on the mainland, of so-called illiterates, which includes mental deficiency cases. The rejections were 9.8 percent in Hawaii, and the rejections on the mainland were 13.4 percent.

Representative ANGELL. Yes; that is what I wanted, Mr. Robertson. The statistics are favorable to the islands.

Chairman DELANEY. That will be admitted as an exhibit for the record.

(Document offered is marked "Exhibit No. 31.")

Mr. ROBERTSON. I would also like to file a statement contained in a letter signed by Maud Jones, archivist in the public archives here, showing the foreign-language newspapers published during the years 1941 and 1942, and a further list showing the language papers published here in 1945 and 1946. One statement covers about two pages, and the other a half a page.

Chairman DELANEY. They will be received for the record and marked as an exhibit.

(Document offered is marked "Exhibit No. 32.")

Representative ANGELL. May I ask Judge Robertson if he will be able to supply the figures showing the circulation of the two leading newspapers here as compared to places of comparable size on the continent.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I believe we will be able to give you that information. [Exhibit No. 56.]

We next present Mr. Newton R. Holcomb, director of the United States Employment Service.

Mr. HOLCOMB. My name is Newton R. Holcomb. I am Territorial Director of the United States Employment Service. I was born in Seattle, Wash., and have been in the Government service for the past 16 years, in Seattle, Wash., Helena, Mont., and Denver, Colo. I came to the Territory in 1940 with the Social Security Board, and in April 1942 I was appointed Territorial director of the United States Employment Service, and later with the creation of the War Manpower Commission I became Territorial director of the War Manpower Commission here.

Chairman DELANEY. Do you have a brief, sir?

Mr. HOLCOMB. Yes. I have already filed it with the committee.

Chairman DELANEY. All right. You may proceed.

Mr. HOLCOMB. I was asked to appear here by the Governor's office to give you a picture of the general employment conditions in the Territory, which is contained in the brief statement which I have filed with the committee. If there is material or data on specific aspects of the employment situation that you gentlemen wish, I will be very glad to prepare it for you and get it into your hands before this committee leaves for the mainland.

Chairman DELANEY. Well, we are running behind schedule, and you are the first witness that was scheduled for this afternoon's session, and we have nearly reached the time for recess, so we suggest you just make a general statement and be as brief as possible.

Mr. HOLCOMB (reading) :

EMPLOYMENT IN THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII

During the peak of war activity in Hawaii, some 220,000 civilian workers were in the labor force. 160,000 of these workers were employed on Oahu, the remainder being distributed among the various other Islands. Over two-thirds of these workers were engaged either in direct war work such as with Army and Navy agencies, or in other activities declared war-essential by the War Manpower Commission. On Oahu, some 40 percent of employed workers in March 1945, were engaged either by the Army or Navy or by their direct contractors. In the other islands' area, the majority of workers were engaged in agriculture and food processing activities, particularly on the sugar and pineapple plantations.

Beginning in 1940 and continuing through the war, a substantial change in the occupational characteristics of the working force was achieved. The shortage of skilled workers available locally during the defense and war periods occasioned the importation of large numbers of skilled workers from the continental United States, many of whom have remained in the community. Wartime needs gave impetus to training programs, and many of the local unskilled and semiskilled workers learned new skills needed in a wartime economy.

During the war, the Army and Navy became the largest employers in the Territory. The Army civilian labor force increased from about 5,500 at the outbreak of war to more than 28,900 in early 1945. Navy civilian employment increased from some 8,500 workers to more than 35,600 in the Spring of 1945. At the end of the war, the civilian labor forces of the Army and Navy included approximately 28,000 workers hired in the continental United States for work in Hawaii, these being distributed at 20,000 for the Navy and 8,000 for the Army.

The composition of local industry and trade, while substantially affected by wartime conditions, was not radically changed in conversion to wartime activity. The basic industries of the Territory continued to supply the same products and services as prior to the war. Generally, the service and maintenance activities of other local industries were not changed basically in operation but merely redirected to satisfy the requirements of the armed forces and the civilian community under a war economy. Thus, the transition from a wartime to peacetime economy is not as difficult in many respects as in main-.

land war centers and is being accomplished primarily by a redirection of activity rather than a substantial change in product and service.

I. POST VJ-DAY EMPLOYMENT

Immediate post-VJ-day employment problems in Hawaii as contrasted with certain mainland areas were lessened because of the following factors:

1. Severe labor shortages existed throughout the Territory prior to VJ-day and labor demand continued much greater than the supply available.

2. Reductions in Army and Navy employment were accomplished primarily by voluntary return of thousands of workers to their mainland homes.

3. Due to prevailing labor shortages, the Army and Navy had been employing large numbers of service personnel in jobs for which sufficient civilians could not be recruited. The release of these service personnel has made it unnecessary to make an over-all reduction in civilian labor forces, and actually has resulted in a continued heavy demand for civilian workers by Army and Navy agencies.

4. Very long workweeks prevailed throughout the community prior to VJ-day. Reduction of the workweek relieved the problem of displacement of workers because of reduced workloads.

5. Government manpower controls limited employment in most establishments to a bare minimum for wartime operation. Removal of these controls on VJ-day resulted in increased employment, particularly in retail and service establishments.

II. THE EMPLOYMENT SITUATION, JANUARY 1, 1946

While the labor situation has eased in many respects since VJ-day, there continues a shortage of workers throughout the Territory, particularly in unskilled occupations. While demand and supply have been gradually approaching a balance in many clerical, sales, and skilled and semiskilled occupations, the shortage of unskilled labor continues critical.

Total employment in the Territory has been reduced since the end of the war, but this reduction has been primarily caused by return of workers to the continental United States. Substantial employment reductions occurred in Army and Navy establishments whose employment dropped from a 1945 peak of 64,500 civilian workers in the spring to 61,000 on VJ-day and to approximately 50,500 workers at the end of the year. [See corrections later made by the witness—footnote of Exhibit 33.] At the same time, employment in nongovernmental activities has increased slightly through employment of workers separating from Federal activities and World War II veterans. Involuntary unemployment is practically nonexistent on Oahu and only of minor proportions on the other Islands.

A. *Other islands area (Hawaii, Maui, Kauai Counties).*—In this area, labor needs are confined almost exclusively to agricultural activities. Pineapple and sugar plantations have stated their requirements as 6,264 workers for both field and industrial work. Employment opportunities in other activities in this area are negligible.

B. *Oahu area.*—Employment exists in most occupational groups and in most industries. Greatest demand is for unskilled workers. The sugar and pineapple plantations have requested an additional 1,555 field hands. Army and Navy instrumentalities such as ships service and Post exchange stores have need for a large number of civilians to replace service personnel formerly engaged in these activities. The Army and Navy are seeking to employ a large number of civilian workers and are recruiting from the continental United States because of inability to obtain sufficient labor locally. Despite material shortages, which hamper expansion of nonmilitary projects, the construction industry is in need of several hundred skilled, semi-skilled, and unskilled workers. Practically all industries, including manufacturing, maintenance activities, and trades and services are in continued need of additional workers of all types.

Attached is a table showing the estimated distribution of employment among major activities in the Territory as of January 1, 1946. [Exhibit No. 33.]

III. EMPLOYMENT PROSPECTS

Long range predictions are difficult at this time due to uncertainty as to the labor forces to be maintained by the Army and Navy and to expansion of existing industries or creation of new industries in the Territory. However, it appears safe to predict, in the absence of large-scale reductions in Federal employment, that the employment outlook in the Territory, particularly on Oahu, over the next several years is good.

On the other Islands, employment opportunities will be limited primarily to the sugar and pineapple industries. This may create problems of unemployment in that area if returning veterans and new entrants into the labor market continue to exhibit present reluctance to enter into or return to plantation employment.

Oahu offers a diversification of industry and service affording excellent employment prospects for the bulk of returning veterans, new entrants into the labor market, and workers gradually being separated from Army and Navy employment. During the next few years, the construction industry should absorb a large additional labor force in view of the construction program, public and private, planned for this area. Present employment levels in most private industries and services should be maintained or increased over the next several years.

While most present labor shortages should disappear during 1946, especially in view of the return of veterans of World War II to civilian employment, it is not anticipated that any material surplus of workers will exist, except perhaps in certain occupations, in view of the proposed expansion of such activities as construction, fishing, and service activities.

It is assumed that over the next few years, there will be a substantial reduction in employment by Army and Navy activities from present levels. However, it can be expected that this reduction will be accompanied by the return of a substantial portion of such workers to their mainland homes. The timing and extent of such a reduction in employment will largely determine the unemployment situation, particularly on Oahu.

There is attached to this statement a breakdown of employment based on the estimates from our office, by islands or by major counties of the Territory. [Exhibit No. 33.]

Chairman DELANEY. For what year?

Mr. HOLCOMB. This is current; for 1946; January 1.

Chairman DELANEY. That would be abnormal, would it not, to take it as of that date; considering the results of the war, and the shortage of many things?

Mr. HOLCOMB. It is a question of where you go. You can use 1940 as a basis, but there has been a substantial increase of population here since 1940. I think it is safe to predict that the employment here is going to be greater in the future than it was in 1940, and it is greater at this present time.

Chairman DELANEY. From your experience, is the laboring class in these islands paid a salary that compares favorably with that paid to men of unskilled trades on the mainland?

Mr. HOLCOMB. Well, I am not very familiar with the wage structure on the mainland, and particularly during the war years, and the wages here have increased substantially, of course, during the war. I think there are other witnesses here who will be more qualified to answer that question than I would.

Chairman DELANEY. All right. Are there any questions you wish to ask Mr. Holcomb? You will be excused.

(Mr. Holcomb excused.)

Chairman DELANEY. Mr. Robertson, present your next witness.

Mr. ROBERTSON. We next present Mr. Ernest H. Norback.

Mr. ERNEST H. NORBACK. My name is Ernest H. Norback, Mr. Chairman. I am the territorial representative of the Wage and Hour Division of the Department of Labor, and also designated as representative of the Secretary of Labor. I have been in active service for the United States Department of Labor for the last 6 years, with the exception of a short period when I was with the United States Army. I was raised and educated in San Francisco, and I have been a resident here for the past 2 years.

Chairman DELANEY. That is sufficient.

Mr. NORBACK. Mr. Chairman, I have a short statement here which I ask permission to file, and to read here, and then I would like to leave myself open for questions.

Chairman DELANEY. Go ahead.

Mr. NORBACK. I will read the statement, first. The following statement is made pursuant to the request of your committee's general counsel that I appear and present information concerning the operations of the United States Department of Labor in the Territory of Hawaii.

As a preface to my remarks, the committee should understand my position: I appear here as an employee of the Wage and Hour and Public Contracts Division of the United States Department of Labor, who has been designated as territorial representative of the Secretary of Labor. My primary responsibility is the enforcement of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 and the Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Act within the Territory. Secondly, while I have no responsibility for administration of programs, I am responsible for—

(1) Answering inquiries of a general nature, and furnishing information thereto, pertaining to the work of the several bureaus of the Department which do not have a representative located in Hawaii;

(2) Reporting and referring questions of a difficult and technical nature to the appropriate bureau in Washington in the absence of employees of the bureau concerned stationed in Hawaii;

(3) Reporting directly to the Secretary of Labor on matters of departmental significance which would also include reactions from organization, management and others on the Islands to the activities of the Department there.

The bureaus of the United States Department of Labor which have representatives located in Hawaii are: Wage and Hour and Public Contracts Division; Conciliation Service; National Wage Stabilization Division; and the United States Employment Service.

The bureaus which do not have representatives of their own stationed permanently in Hawaii are: Bureau of Labor Statistics; Division of Labor Standards; Children's Bureau; and the Solicitor's Office.

From time to time, representatives of these bureaus visit the Territory. During the absence of these representatives I perform the tasks just outlined.

The various laws relating to labor which are interpreted and enforced by the United States Department of Labor apply to Hawaii as well as the 48 States. Specifically, these are laws such as the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, the Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Act, and the Davis-Bacon prevailing wage Law.

As you know, the Federal Department of Labor maintains a general interest in all labor legislation enacted and enforced by the several States and Territories. The Director of the Territorial Department of Labor and Industrial Relations, I understand, will present you with a summary of these laws which have been adopted by the Territorial government since the last statehood hearings were held. There is no point in duplicating the effort here. I wish only to make these general comments in connection with that territorial legislation and its enforcement: The Territory of Hawaii at the present time compares favorably with the most progressive States in the Union in its laws relating to labor. In some respects, such as wage and hour legislation, it is considerably in advance of other States. Insofar as enforcement of this legislation is concerned, I believe that the Territorial agency is staffed with capable, conscientious persons. It has done an able job, although I have no standards to compare the work here with that of other States. Finally, I cannot let this opportunity pass without stating that the relationship between the Territorial and Federal departments of labor here has been of the best. It is difficult to imagine a better relationship between a Federal and State department in the same field.

Chairman DELANEY. Do any of the committee wish to ask any questions?

(No response.)

Mr. ROBERTSON. May we present Mr. McComas, director of labor and industrial relations.

Mr. McCOMAS. My name is L. Q. McComas; age, 46; born and raised in the State of Maryland; educated in the Maryland public schools, and in the State of New York. I am a graduate of the United States Military Academy, class of 1925, whereupon I entered in the service of the United States Army and remained there until physically retired in 1938. Hawaii has been my home since 1931. Upon my retirement from the Army I became executive secretary of the Unemployment Compensation Board of the Territory of Hawaii, and in 1941 I was appointed director of labor and industrial relations, of the Department of Labor, Territory of Hawaii, the position which I have continued to hold [reading]:

I have been asked to explain to you the functions of the Territorial department of labor and industrial relations and review its activities. We have submitted numerous exhibits on the subject of labor in Hawaii and will make a comprehensive written report on the department's administration of laws within its jurisdiction. At this time I shall give you a tabloid history of these laws and of the department's administration thereof.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR AND INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

You will recall that the report of the joint committee on statehood for Hawaii, after hearings in October 1937, recommended that the Territorial legislature establish a department of labor. The legislature acted on this recommendation at its first session after the hearings. On May 16, 1939, it approved Act 237, creating a Territorial department of labor and industrial relations, to begin operations on the 1st of January 1940. Four bureaus were named: Workmen's compensation, unemployment compensation, labor law enforcement, research and statistics. An organization chart has been given to you for your assistance in following my outline of department activities. [Exhibit No. 33A.]

You will see that the Governor of Hawaii appoints five commissioners of labor and industrial relations, for 5-year terms. These commissioners serve without pay; they meet regularly once a month and more often if need be. The commission is charged with direction and control of the department and with the making of rules and regulations to enforce the laws within its jurisdiction. It prescribes rules and regulations for protection of the health and safety of Hawaii's workers and assists in mediating labor disputes.

The commission appoints, and assigns legal duties to, the department attorney, who also acts as a deputy attorney general.

The commission appoints the director, who is the chief administrative officer. He supervises and directs all department functions and enforces the commission's rules and regulations. All department personnel is appointed by the director, subject to civil service laws. Each bureau is headed by an assistant to the director. A county agent represents the department in Hawaii, Maui, and Kauai. These agents are directly responsible to the director and are under the functional supervision of the bureau heads.

One of our exhibits lists Hawaii laws affecting labor generally, government employees and veterans (exhibit 11 A). We shall furnish you with complete copies of the particular laws administered by the department.

BUREAU OF WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION

Hawaii has had a workmen's compensation law since 1915. I believe this law antedates several State laws. Prior to the 1939 legislation above referred to, the law was administered by industrial accident boards for the several counties. Act 237 transferred this administration to the director of labor and industrial relations and the bureau of workmen's compensation. The director was empowered to make awards of compensation, and uniform procedures for appeals on these awards were established. Please refer to your chart for the composition of the appeal boards. Board members, who serve on a per diem basis, are appointed by the Governor and confirmed by the senate.

It is impossible for me to compress into a few words the improvements in our workmen's compensation law since 1937. The commission of labor has never ceased to study this phase of protective legislation, and at each session has submitted amendments for the consideration of the legislators. Our lawmakers have responded generously. In 1945, to use a good old campaign phrase, I can "state, without fear of contradiction" that Hawaii's workmen's compensation law ranks high up with the best laws in the entire country.

We have compulsory coverage for industrial employment, as defined by the law, plus provision for voluntary coverage by employers who elect to insure exempt employees; we have a special fund for second injury claims; all injuries must be reported promptly; our benefit percentages equal those of the Federal Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act—reputedly an excellent piece of legislation. To save time—I suggest that a few moments study, at your convenience, of the pictorial charts which accompany our detailed report will convince you of Hawaii's high standing compared to areas which now enjoy statehood.

BUREAU OF UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

Hawaii's unemployment compensation program was initiated by the 1937 legislature and was originally carried on by a Territorial board of seven members, including the chairmen of the commissions for Hawaii, Maui, and Kauai. The 1937 session imposed tax liability on industrial employers of one or more persons after such employment for 20 or more weeks in a year. Following recommendations of the board, the 1939 legislature extensively revised the act, and at this session transferred administration to the department of labor, effective January 1940.

The commission has not been content with a law which might be considered adequate but has continuously studied the program and submitted more and more progressive amendments for the consideration of the legislature; in turn, the legislators have progressively improved this vital law. As it now stands on the books, Hawaii's legislation is more liberal, from the standpoint of both employer and employee, than that of any State except, perhaps, New York. You may want to take time later to study the tabulations we have supplied showing maximum and minimum benefits, duration periods,

and qualifications on wages, for the States and for Hawaii. [Exhibits 11-L and 11-M.]

Briefly, our law covers industrial employers of one or more persons, immediately upon such employment. Maximum weekly benefits are \$25, with a maximum duration of 20 weeks in a year, or a possible total of \$500 in benefits based on qualifying wages of only \$750.

Since April 1941, Hawaii employers have been able to figure their tax payments on their benefit experience—that is, the percentage of pay rolls which they pay into the compensation fund is determined by the ratio which the reserve in their individual account bears to their average pay rolls over a 3-year period. These ratios have been reduced repeatedly, and many employers now have a zero rate. Only those whose reserve ratio is less than 4 percent now pay the standard rate of 2.7 percent. Notwithstanding these reductions, our trust fund is in a robust state of health. In fact, the interest earned up to the most recent quarterly report has been more than ample to meet our total benefit payments to date. [See exhibit 11-C for numbers of employing units reporting to the bureau.]

Hawaii's service men and women have not been neglected by the legislators, who have made careful provision at each session during the war to insure their eligibility for compensation if they should require this aid on their return to the Territory. The bureau also acts as agent of the Veterans' Administration in carrying out provisions of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 pertaining to readjustment allowances. At present it seems unlikely that any of them will require long periods of readjustment.

Unemployment has been virtually nonexistent in Hawaii for several years. I believe Mr. Holcomb has discussed the employment situation and given you projections for the future as they can be made today. Your attention is invited to tabulations of claims filed in Hawaii and in the States during the week ending December 1, 1945 [exhibit 11-N].

The Territory maintained public employment offices in Honolulu, Hilo, Wailuku, and Lihue, under the 1937 law, until the President's order in January 1942 transferred the public employment service to the Federal Government, for the period of the emergency.

BUREAU OF LABOR LAW ENFORCEMENT

A new bureau was created by Act 237, Laws of 1939, to enforce Hawaii labor laws. Since March 1940 the child-labor division of the bureau has acted as agent of the Children's Bureau of the United States Department of Labor, and its certification of proof of age is accepted by the Federal Bureau.

The 1937 congressional committee commented unfavorably on Hawaii's lack of a child-labor law. I am confident that the 1945 committee will report that we now have an excellent law for the protection of our young workers. We have supplied you with a digest showing what is permitted and what is "kapu," or forbidden, under Hawaii's law [exhibit 11-B]. The law affords protection up to the eighteenth birthday and prescribes working hours and conditions of employment varying with the age groups. The commission and the division are vigilant in their concern for the welfare of these future citizens. Our detailed report will give you more complete data on the employment of minors since the division began operations.

The wage-and-hour division was established at a special session of the legislature in 1941, to enforce Hawaii's wage-and-hour law, passed at that session. On July 1, 1945, a minimum wage of 40 cents an hour throughout the Territory became effective. The Territorial workweek is 48 hours; that is, time and a half the regular rate must be paid for work over 48 hours. Comprehensive measures have been enacted for enforcing the law and collecting wages due under its terms—we shall give you the number of workers benefited and the amounts collected. The law is patterned closely after the Fair Labor Standards Act, containing some identical wording. Its most praiseworthy feature is that it covers all employees—men, women, and children.

BUREAU OF RESEARCH AND STATISTICS

The 1939 act creating the bureau of research and statistics provides that it shall collect data on wages, hours, and other conditions of employment in the Territory, shall collect and publish information on labor and industrial relations, and may investigate and publish such cost-of-living information as it may deem advisable.

Since it began operations in August 1940, the bureau has published a number of wage-and-hour studies, and maintains data on wages and hours in occupational and industrial classifications, which are available to the public. Among our exhibits are tables of the average weekly wages of industrial workers in Hawaii and comparisons of wages with similar workers in the mainland. We have also given you a list of the employing units reporting to the unemployment compensation bureau, and the average monthly number of their employees. [Exhibits 11-C to F.]

The Pineapple Growers Association and the Hawaiian Sugar Planters Association have furnished to the bureau statistics on various phases of their operations and of employment in the pineapple and sugar industries, which have been included among the labor exhibits. [Exhibits 11-G and 11-H.]

The local bureau issues quarterly changes in the index of cost of goods and services to consumers in Honolulu. This index was set up by the Territorial bureau as of March 1943, following a survey of family earnings and spending in Honolulu, made by the Federal Bureau of Labor Statistics. The list of those who regularly receive this information is growing rapidly. The Federal Bureau uses our material in its publications on living costs. [Exhibits 11-I, J, K.] The local bureau also conducted a study of family spending habits on islands other than Oahu, for the year 1944, and maintains a separate index for these islands.

You will find among your exhibits a short version of the bureau's semiannual directory of Hawaii labor organizations. It also publishes bulletins on unemployment compensation activities, assembles and publishes the department annual reports and issues press releases. It records labor disputes in Hawaii, listing the industry and union involved, the issues stated and, when possible, the man-days lost. Our exhibits include a copy of this record from January 1940 to November 1945. [Exhibit 11-O, labor organizations; 11-P, labor disputes.]

The research library on many phases of labor and industrial relations is frequently used by the public. The bureau mailing list carries over 600 names, including many State departments with which we exchange material.

APPRENTICESHIP

The legislators of Hawaii were not unaware of the need for a steady supply of skilled workers. In 1941 they took action to insure this supply in the future. The first group of young men to complete the Territorial apprenticeship program received their certificates in the Governor's office in the spring of 1945. The program started early in 1942 with the appointment, by the director of labor, of a territorial director of apprenticeship. If you will glance at your chart, you will observe that this program has the benefit of advice by an apprenticeship council, composed of three members representing employers and three representing employees. The director of the training program for the department of public instruction and the director of the public employment service are ex-officio members. In addition committees of interested citizens in several communities have contributed guidance in devising trade standards. The law stipulates the terms of agreements under which Hawaii youth may be indentured for training through organized experience on the job and related class instruction. Hawaii employers also recognize the need for building up our local stock of skilled workers, and the number of training programs in private industry is increasing in a most encouraging manner.

LABOR RELATIONS

One of the duties of the director, not shown on the chart, was prescribed by an act of the 1941 legislature. This act set forth the policy of the Territory relative to work stoppages and stated its concern for the best interests of its citizens in labor disputes affecting public utilities. Time limits which were established for notifying the director of labor and industrial relations when disputes arise, and for his appointment of mediators, effectively constitute a "cooling-off period" before the public can be inconvenienced by work stoppages. Penalties are provided for violation of the law on the part of either employers or employees in public utilities, as defined by the law.

The department has participated actively in mediation of labor disputes in the Territory and has been able to avert work stoppages in many instances by bringing together the parties in dispute and reconciling their differences. We shall supply you with a more detailed record of the mediation activities of the department, in our later report.

I should be remiss in my duties if I failed to invite your attention to the splendid record of labor in Hawaii during the emergency period. Working under the most adverse conditions, Hawaii's labor force stayed on the job and kept the pledge against work stoppages. The number of man-days lost by work stoppages, during the war period, was just about one-thousandth of 1 percent of the total man-days available.

I believe the members of this committee will agree with me, after an independent study of the record, that Hawaii can be justifiably

proud of its progress in labor legislation during the 8 years which have passed since the previous statehood hearings. We have revised, rewritten, and repealed old laws and we have enacted new ones, and we shall continue to do so, having before us the aim of the optimum in protection of labor in Hawaii. I also believe that many jurisdictions now receiving the privileges of membership in the sisterhood of States might do well to follow Hawaii's lead in labor legislation.

Representative ANGELL. Do you know how the labor wage scales and standards here in Hawaii compare with those in the continental United States?

Mr. McCOMAS. I have some data on that, in comparison with coverages under the unemployment compensation law; a comparison of weekly earnings.

Representative ANGELL. I wonder if you would submit for the record those figures so that we may have them.

Mr. McCOMAS. I can submit those for the record. (See statement No. 27.)

Chairman DELANEY. Any further questions?

(No response.)

Mr. ROBERTSON. We next present Dr. W. H. Loper, chairman of the Hawaii Employment Relations Board.

Chairman DELANEY. Proceed.

Mr. LOPER. My name is W. H. Loper. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I have been in the Territory some 22 years, and most of that time has been spent in the field of public education. During the past 18 months I have been cochairman of the Territorial War Labor Board, and a public member of that board, and with the termination of the War Labor Board I returned to the school department, and have continued as chairman of the Hawaii Employment Relations Board.

I have been asked to present evidence from the field of labor relations that may be pertinent to the issue of statehood at this time. I have a statement which can be submitted, but it will take probably 10 minutes to go over it. [Statement No. 6.]

During the war years, and especially after the lifting of martial law, in 1944, the labor movement in Hawaii experienced a rapid growth and matured and entered into the economic and political life of these islands. Witnesses to follow will no doubt submit figures on this rapid growth. The transfer of jurisdiction over wages and labor disturbances from military control to civil control was completed with the establishment of the Territorial War Labor Board in June of 1944. During my 18 months as cochairman and public member of the Territorial War Labor Board I saw nothing in the employer-employee relationships here, nor in the activities of labor unions, to indicate that workers in Hawaii are not ready to carry the full responsibilities of citizens of a State. On the contrary, there was much to indicate just the opposite. The creating of the War Labor Board of Hawaii may itself be taken as an indication that employers and the unions were ready and anxious to throw off military control over wages and labor disputes, and submit themselves to these necessary wartime controls as they were operating in the States. The attitude of employers and employees alike was one of cooperation with the Board in the full realization of the neces-

sity of this control. Out of some 1,800 applications for wage adjustments handled by the staff of the Territorial War Labor Board only 22 applications for reconsideration of board action were filed, and only one appeal taken to the National Board in Washington. The same attitude was found with respect to labor disputes. Out of a total of only 15 labor disputes certified to the Territorial War Labor Board 8 were settled by agreement of the parties, and withdrawn from our docket, and 4 were closed by directive order of the Territorial War Labor Board, and 3 were appealed to Washington to be settled by directive order of the National Board upholding the action of the local board.

There was no problem of compliance with our directive orders during the 14 months of the board's existence, prior to VJ-day, and the enforcement in wage stabilization cases resulted in penalties for noncompliance in six or eight cases out of some 200 cases of alleged violation, and most of which were brought into voluntary compliance on request and with no penalty.

Perhaps the most significant fact bearing on the question of statehood is the nonracial character of these labor unions. There has been in the labor history of Hawaii an attempt to organize unions to work along race lines, and the fallacy of this approach is now recognized by the labor unions. They have learned their lesson well, and I know of no union in Hawaii which will tolerate a wage bracket and differential based on race. The unions will not approve of such differentials, and the significance of this attitude on the subject of statehood is obvious, and I know of no evidence of block voting along race lines in any union elections. This refusal of unions to allow race distinctions to interfere with or disrupt their union activities carries over into the political field, and the union members in Hawaii have shown by the manner in which they conduct their own affairs that they believe democracy to be a matter of ideals and loyalty and not one of geography and of race.

The war record of the unions in Hawaii with respect to the 'no-strike pledge'—and figures for the mainland indicate that less than one-tenth of 1 percent of all available man-days were lost due to strikes—and the figures for the Territory are even better—quoting from the records of the War Labor Board: Only three strikes occurred prior to VJ-day, and involved less than 500 workers, perhaps a loss of a thousand man-days of work—all that stands on our record to mar it. It is true that the record with respect to strikes since the end of the war has not been so good, and the fine spirit shown in labor relations during the war has since then shown some deterioration. These are small indeed, however, in comparison with those disagreements that have developed on the mainland, and could hardly be used as an argument against statehood.

The point I wish to make is that with the rapid growth of unionism here these past few years, there has come a rapid growth of methods and rules between employers and employees and the growth of regulations to deal with these labor relations in a fair manner. This was recognized by the Territorial legislature at its 1945 session in the passage of the bill creating the Hawaii Employment Relations Board, and the passage of an act which is otherwise known as the Little Wagner Act which extends its benefits to agricultural workers, which

are not covered by the NLRA, on the matter of collective bargaining, and it is my understanding that only one other State, the State of Wisconsin, has such a law. It is designed primarily to cover employees engaged in agriculture.

The Hawaii Employment Relations Act provides for a board of three members and a conciliator. Unlike the National Labor Relations Act it covers unfair labor practices on the part of the union and its members as well as those on the part of the employer. It has been in existence too short a time to report on it; it is too early to report on this new law, as the board has just begun to function and the first hearing involving any agricultural workers is to be scheduled on the Big Island in the near future.

It must be admitted that the development of full-fledged labor movements came late in Hawaii as compared with the mainland in general. As I have indicated, however, this does not mean that we are now far behind the mainland, or the mainland communities in our methods of dealing with labor problems.

Chairman DELANEY. Any questions? [No response.]

Mr. ROBERTSON. We present our next speaker, Mr. Jack Hall, who speaks for the CIO.

Mr. JACK W. HALL. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is Jack Hall; I was born in Ashland, Wis., and raised in California. I came to Hawaii as a merchant seaman some 10 years ago, and since that time have been connected with the labor movement, except for 2 years when I was employed with the Territorial department of labor, in the law enforcement section [reading]:

This statement is presented in behalf of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, affiliated with the Congress of Industrial Organizations, and the 33,000 workers it represents in Hawaiian industry.

The International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, hereinafter referred to as the ILWU, is unqualifiedly on record for the Territory of Hawaii being granted statehood at once. The international executive board of the ILWU at its meeting in Washington, D. C., in October 1945 unanimously endorsed immediate statehood for the Territory.

Locally the demand of our membership is for statehood now. The Territorial ILWU policy committee, representing the top leadership of our organization here in the islands, unanimously supported statehood at its meeting on December 30, 1945. On January 6, 1946, the Oahu ILWU council, representing all ILWU members on the island of Oahu, similarly declared itself. Our various councils, locals, and units have or are now considering like action and we will furnish for the record of these hearings documentation of their action.

CHANGES IN HAWAII'S ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL LIFE SINCE THE CONGRESSIONAL HEARINGS ON STATEHOOD HELD IN 1937

Far sweeping changes in the political and economic life of the Territory of Hawaii have taken place since a congressional committee held hearings in Honolulu during 1937 on the matter of statehood for Hawaii.

(1) *Economic changes.*—When Dr. James H. Shoemaker in his report to the Department of Labor, Labor in the Territory of Hawaii,

1939, described labor organization as "meager" and said that they had "gained little footing" he spoke the truth for the time. He was right when he said:

There is a tendency on the part of management to assume that unionism is synonymous with dangerous radicalism. * * * The result of this attitude is the feeling that labor unionism is a common menace to all Hawaiian enterprise, and that the duty of combating its development is a common problem of the management of all industries whenever labor troubles occur. Thus, although management has done much for labor in Hawaii, it has also used every influence at its command to restrict labor organization.

In the 2 years immediately prior to the war, trade-unions began to make their first substantial inroads into a hitherto practically invulnerable fortress of antiunionism. In part this was the result of expanding Government employment during the defense period and the opening of new job opportunities free from the economic control of our dominant, closely interlocked employer group.

With the war and martial law, unions suffered substantial setbacks. Military commanders, particularly on the outside islands, were definitely antagonistic to organized labor.

It was not until the summer and fall of 1943 that trade-unions began to grow. On January 1, 1944, the ILWU could claim but a mere 900 members. Other CIO unions with a prewar membership of 2,000 were defunct.

Today, 2 years later, the vast majority of the workers in Hawaii's basic industries—sugar and pineapple—are represented by the ILWU. Some 33,000 employees of all nationalities, races, and creeds are employed either in the bargaining units for which the ILWU has been certified or for which it has pending requests for recognition. Employees of 31 sugar companies are now covered by union agreements with the ILWU. Part of one company is under contract with the AFL but the ILWU recently petitioned the NLRB to conduct an election to determine the present wishes of its employees. Unorganized are two small companies producing less than 15,000 tons of sugar per year.

The ILWU has been certified as representative for all nine pineapple canneries and we are presently discussing contracts with them on an industry-wide basis.

The field workers of two small outer island companies and workers on the inaccessible island of Lanai alone remain to be organized in the pineapple industry.

Every stevedore in Hawaii employed by civilian concerns is either under ILWU contracts or will be within a few weeks.

Most employees of our three railroad companies are under ILWU contracts. And a score of smaller firms whose business is generally related to our basic industries are either under union agreements or are presently engaged in contract discussions with the ILWU.

ILWU contracts negotiated in the past year have brought nearly \$10,000,000 in wage increases to workers covered thereby.

During 1945 the ILWU won 138 separate elections conducted by either the NLRB, National Mediation Board, Territorial department of labor and industrial relations, or by mutual agreement and cross-checks of union membership against company pay rolls. More than 95 percent of the workers voting in these elections cast their votes for ILWU representation.

Organized labor is in Hawaii to stay and it will continue to play an important role in the economic life of Hawaii in the years to come.

It is important to note in connection with the rapid growth of the ILWU in the Territory that only three cases of unfair labor practices by the employers were filed with the NLRB by the ILWU during 1944 and 1945. All of these cases were settled without recourse to formal hearings before the NLRB. A far cry indeed from the violent employer opposition to unionization that spilled much blood on the fertile Hawaiian soil.

Have Hawaiian employers changed their attitude toward organized labor?

We think they have to some extent, perhaps under compulsion, it is true; but it has changed, and we think those employers who still hope unionism is a passing fancy in Hawaii are a miserable minority.

We look for no infinite period of sweetness and light between employers and unions in Hawaii. There may be disagreements and strikes in the future. But there is a growing mutual respect and confidence in our industrial relations.

Those Members of Congress who fear that statehood for Hawaii would strengthen the economic control of the so-called Big Five over the workers of these islands may dispel them. We are confident Hawaii's workers are now and will remain free workers shaping their own destiny in accordance with the democratic processes of our Nation and Constitution.

(2) *Political changes.*—There are members of the Congress who entertain the belief that statehood for Hawaii would merely mean that the Congressmen from these islands would be handpicked by the Big Five. That belief is completely erroneous today, in 1946.

It is certainly true, and we in the labor movement have stated it time and again, that the Big Five dominated the political life of these islands from the days of royalty until recent years. The legislature did its bidding.

If that political control existed today—and thank God it does not—we would be violently opposed to statehood at this time.

Much is made of the fact that the people of Hawaii voted 2 to 1 for statehood in the 1940 plebiscite. The opposition at that time came from workers. It was a vote of protest against the Big Five control of our political life. The workers felt that they were safer under the parental guidance of a sympathetic Congress and the paternal protection of the Interior Department. Now, however, the people of Hawaii are outgrowing adolescence and wish to stand on their own feet, shouldering both the rights and responsibilities of adults, statehood. Today a plebiscite would reveal the people of these islands are at least 10 to 1 in favor of statehood.

There has been the substantial change in the complexion of our Territorial legislature.

Out of the 30 seats in the house of representatives, 16 of those elected were from the 21 endorsed by Labor's Political Action Committee. In the senate, out of nine positions open, the LFAC-endorsed candidates for seven seats and six candidates were elected. Two officials of the ILWU, Joseph Alapai Kaholokula, Jr., and Amos Ignacio were elected to the house. Both of these men were ordinary plantation workers prior to unionization of the sugar industry.

Many prominent legislators whom the people had regarded as Big Five appointees went down to overwhelming defeat.

The trend toward a more representative legislature has caused Hawaii to spurt ahead in the field of social and labor legislation and the administration of such legislation has been both encouraging and liberal.

Whereas Hawaii was without a department of labor when Congress investigated statehood in 1937, today these islands can boast of a labor department which need not fear comparison with any State in the Union.

The department administers ably today a wage-and-hour law more inclusive than that of any other State—extending even to agricultural labor. It administers an unemployment-compensation law far more liberal than that of most States. Our workmen's compensation law is better than the national average. Our child labor law has shown progressive improvement and its enforcement is gratifyingly strict.

The 1945 session of our Legislature enacted for Hawaii a Territorial Labor Relations Act, a "little Wagner Act", which extends the right of organization and collective bargaining to agricultural labor. No State, except Wisconsin and that State only by implication, has yet taken such a forthright step in labor legislation. Yes, Hawaii has come a long way from the arrogant management which characterized it a few short years ago.

THE SO-CALLED RACE PROBLEM IN HAWAII

Much opposition in Congress to statehood from Hawaii appears to be an apprehension that citizens of Japanese ancestry would and do vote in racial blocs and by reason of their numbers would control the political life of the islands if statehood were granted.

This is a gross untruth and a slander upon the integrity and Americanism of our citizens of Japanese derivation. The military record of the One Hundredth Infantry and the Four Hundred and Forty-Second Combat Battalion dispels any question of loyalty. The complete absence of any sabotage by citizens or aliens of Japanese ancestry during the war has been vouched for by military commanders in this area.

As far as voting only for candidates of their own nationality, the record of prewar elections dissolves this fabrication. Proportionally, the AJA's have always had less than their racial share in the legislature. The question of race has never been a serious factor in determining the election of legislators. A Negro was once elected to our house of representatives even though there were less than 500 registered voters of that race.

A person of Japanese ancestry has never been elected to the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of Honolulu, even though many have tried with the full support of the highly organized Republican Party. In point of view of numbers, voters of Japanese ancestry could have elected candidates of their ancestry in 1941 had they chosen to do so.

Our experience in the election of the various officials of the ILWU in the Territory is a concrete demonstration that Japanese do not vote en bloc for racial control, even though in point of numbers they represent nearly 50 percent of our membership.

President of the ILWU council on the big island of Hawaii is Representative Amos Ignacio of Portuguese extraction. The secretary-treasurer is Bert Nakano, a stevedore, who has been reelected each year an official of his local, throughout the war, even though there was not a single worker of Japanese ancestry employed on the Hilo water front.

An ILWU sugar local on Hawaii embracing 13 separate plantations has a Portuguese worker, a Japanese, a Filipino and a Caucasian-Chinese-Hawaiian as its top officers.

On Maui, the top official is Representative Kaholokula, as Hawaiian as King Kamehameha.

Kauai's local president is Willeam Paia, a Hawaiian. Japanese and Filipinos make up the remainder of the leadership.

Only on Oahu is a worker of Japanese ancestry the perennially reelected headman. He is Jack Kawano, president of the Oahu ILWU Council and of the local of Honolulu stevedores—who, incidentally, gave Honolulu the best turnaround record for ships during the war of any American port. Kawano is reelected each year for his leadership in the labor movement and not for his race; workers of Japanese ancestry have never numbered more than 25 percent of the stevedores employed in Honolulu.

Our international executive board member, elected by the entire membership in Hawaii, is K. K. Kam, as Chinese as jasmine tea.

The same picture is true throughout all of the locals and units of the ILWU in Hawaii. Workers are chosen for their qualities of leadership, not for their race. Our leadership roster includes Hawaiians and part Hawaiians, Portuguese, Spanish, Puerto Ricans, Italians, Swedes, Russians, Filipinos, Chinese, Japanese, and even Anglo-Saxons.

We in the ILWU are not worried about racial bloc voting. It is a bogeyman raised by the opponents of full democratic rights for the people of these islands. It is ballooned by those who have no love for democracy either in Hawaii or in the Nation.

The citizens and voters of Hawaii, now free from the political domination of the Big Five, will—as in the Nation—elect their legislators and public officials for their programs and their qualities of leadership.

In conclusion, the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, CIO, strongly urges the House Committee on the Territories to recommend, and the Congress of the United States to grant, immediate statehood to the Territory of Hawaii.

Now is the time for statehood, the ILWU believes, because the people of Hawaii have broken the chains of feudalism. They are prepared and able to shape their own destinies. They ask only the democratic privileges and rights to which they are entitled as a free people. They ask no more than the United Nations guaranteed the peoples of the world—the fullest extension of democracy consistent with ability to govern. And, finally, they ask the removal of that ever-present sword of Damocles—the threat of authoritarian commission government.

Chairman DELANEY. Mr. Hall, were you present when the representative of the Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association, Chauncey M. Wightman, testified here?

Mr. HALL. I was.

Chairman DELANEY. Did you hear his testimony?

Mr. HALL. I did.

Chairman DELANEY. Relative to the wage of a field worker being \$5.11, that is, the take-home pay?

Mr. HALL. Yes.

Chairman DELANEY. Have you any comment, or does that coincide with the records that you have?

Mr. HALL. I would agree that that is an average wage. There are many employees getting far less.

Chairman DELANEY. Now, what is your attitude toward the employment of minors between the age of 14 and 16 at the rate of 40 cents an hour?

Mr. HALL. We have tried to discourage that. As a matter of fact, when the schools were open only 4 days a week it was only the CIO and the parent-teachers' association that asked the department of public instruction to go back on a 5-day week so that the school children could stay in school instead of being out in the plantations.

Chairman DELANEY. In that 40 cents an hour is there any deduction for social security or anything like that?

Mr. HALL. Well, the usual tax deductions. There was no deduction for perquisites.

Chairman DELANEY. We have been hearing some comment about the importation of labor to work in the fields. Have you any comment to make on that?

Mr. HALL. I am glad you asked that, Mr. Delaney. When the importation of Philippine labor was originally proposed during the war period, we advised the Governor and the Interior Department that with certain restrictions we would have no objection to the importation, and we anticipated at that time that the war would, unfortunately, last for a good deal longer period than it did. With the termination of the war we have reversed our position, and today we are unqualifiedly against the importation of any labor.

Admittedly, a labor shortage of some proportions may exist on plantations, but from our experience, however, we believe the fact to be that it would cost the industry something in the neighborhood of \$3,000,000 to import and return some 6,000 workers, and that same sum paid to the workers would pay for 10,000,000 additional hours of overtime, and that the employees on the plantations are willing to work those additional hours. As a matter of fact, since the war there has been a substantial reduction in the work, actually; at the present time I do not believe there are any field laborers who are engaged in work over 48 hours a week.

At the Oahu Sugar Co., at Waipahu on this island, the workweek has been cut from the wartime period of 72 to the present 48. We are not in favor of lengthy workweeks, but we have what I believe is a temporary shortage, and our members are willing to work the additional hours.

I would like to say, in connection with your question, sir, and for the record, if you wish a copy of the letter sent to Governor Stainback, we would be pleased to furnish it.

Chairman DELANEY. Without objection, it will be received and made a part of this record.

Mr. HALL. We will supply it (exhibit No. 34).

Chairman DELANEY. Are you familiar with the living conditions of the workers who live on the plantations?

Mr. HALL. I am, intimately.

Chairman DELANEY. In your opinion do the living conditions on the plantations compare favorably with that of the conditions of workingmen on the mainland?

Mr. HALL. Well, it depends on which workingmen. If you were to take the agricultural areas in the United States, I would say in the main the living conditions here are no better and no worse.

Chairman DELANEY. Does that meet with the approval of labor?

Mr. HALL. No. We certainly want improved living standards on the plantations. You might say that perhaps 20 or 25 percent of the employees live in what are really modern homes, and very satisfactory; perhaps another 25 percent are fair, and then I would say that there are probably half of the homes that really need tearing down and starting over again.

Chairman DELANEY. Any questions?

Delegate FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask Mr. Hall this question: In your statement concerning the question of race you refer to individuals in positions of leadership by racial ancestry. By that you do not mean to suggest that they are not American citizens?

Mr. HALL. No, certainly not.

Delegate FARRINGTON. Probably 95 percent of your membership is Hawaiian born?

Mr. HALL. What percentage, sir?

Delegate FARRINGTON. 95 percent.

Mr. HALL. I would not say it was that high.

Delegate FARRINGTON. What percentage, then? I will put the question that way.

Mr. HALL. I would say that it is perhaps between 85 and 90 percent, who are either Hawaiian born or Filipino nationals, sir.

Chairman DELANEY. Any other questions? Thank you.

(Mr. Hall is excused.)

Mr. ROBERTSON. We have one more witness on this agenda, Mr. Reuben Ortiz, who speaks for the AFL.

Mr. REUBEN ORTIZ. At this time may I file with the secretary a letter signed by Mr. Harry Kuhia, Jr., president of Local 904, Gasoline and Oil Drivers, Warehousemen and Helpers of Teamsters Union, who requests that it be brought to your attention.

Chairman DELANEY. It will be received and incorporated into the record.

(The letter of the Gasoline and Oil Drivers, Warehousemen and Helpers Local Union 904 of I. B. of T., C., W and H., affiliated with Central Labor Council and American Federation of Labor, reads as follows:)

JANUARY 4, 1946.

Mr. IRWIN SILVERMAN,

Chief Counsel for the House Territory Subcommittee,

Halekulani Hotel, Honolulu, T. H.

DEAR SIR: Our union, composed of workers of the Honolulu Gas Co. and of the large oil distributors, voted at a meeting held last night to thank you and the Honorable Harold Ickes for your forthright stand for full statehood for the Territory of Hawaii. We would appreciate it very much if you, sir, would convey a copy of this letter to the congressional committee involved, as we are very grateful for the time and trouble to which the committee members have gone on our behalf.

We especially ask of the Congressmen that they examine the responsible role performed by all workers of Hawaii in furthering the war effort despite many trying circumstances of poor housing, forced labor under martial law, strict curfews, and the like.

Labor disputes during wartime in Hawaii, according to official figures, only disrupted production seven-millionths of 1 percent, a low unmatched anywhere else in the world. Along with this record for work responsibility and industrial peace in the Territory of Hawaii, consider the high points reached in bond sales, the blood bank, and in fact all that ever was asked of the people of Hawaii.

Our union also would like to answer the charge frequently made that the Big Five completely dominates economic and political life in this Territory. Popular political opinion and the strength of organized labor are guaranties that the old economic feudalism once prevalent here shall never return.

Few States in the mainland of the United States have entered upon statehood with anything near the high level of culture, democratic spirit, and political maturity now present among these island peoples.

No one in Hawaii worries about any one race or nationality capturing control over these islands, as no one race or nationality ever dreams that such a thing is possible. Our peoples live and work too closely together, and are too thoroughly democratic in their thinking to play the fool's game of national dominance.

And finally we feel that all America can understand the strong pride with which we regard the Purple Heart heroes of the Hawaiian battalions, including our Americans of Japanese ancestry.

Yes, we of the organized labor movement feel fully qualified to assume the role of full partners in the affairs of Uncle Sam.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY KUHIA, Jr.,

*President, Local 904, Gasoline and Oil Drivers, Warehousemen and
Helpers of Teamsters Union, A. F. of L.*

Chairman DELANEY. You may proceed.

Mr. ORTIZ. My name is Reuben Ortiz. I am president of the central labor council of the American Federation of Labor; I am 30 years old. I was born in Mexico. I am an American citizen, naturalized. I was raised in Texas and came to Hawaii about 15 years ago. I have been connected with the American Federation of Labor in various capacities for about 9 years. I have a very brief statement, Mr. Chairman. As a matter of fact, we were put into the proponents of statehood, but as you will see by the statement, it should have been put in as being neither pro or con.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, at the American Federation of Labor's central labor council meeting held on January 4, 1945, the question of statehood for Hawaii was taken up. There was much discussion on the question. The delegates assembled were about evenly divided on the question of statehood for Hawaii, and as a result, the only official action taken by the central labor council, was that it would not commit the membership of the AFL on the question one way or the other, but would leave each individual union to its own decision.

But if I may, I would like to tell the committee one or two reasons why I believe the AFL could not take a definite stand on the matter. To begin with, our membership has had very little time to which to prepare a proper presentation to your committee, even if it were clear on where they stood on the question.

Not very long ago, Secretary of the Interior Harold Ickes directed a blast against statehood for Hawaii. I think that you gentlemen know about that. That blast by Mr. Ickes had a stunning effect on the citizenry of Hawaii insofar as any optimistic ideas of early statehood for Hawaii were concerned. There were very few citizens that had the fortitude to come forth and attempt to refute Mr. Ickes'

charges against the Territory which he said was inimical to the cause of statehood for Hawaii.

Chairman DELANEY. It is our recollection that it was not a "blast." It was, rather, a recommendation; but that is your conclusion.

Mr. ORTIZ. That is the way it was taken here in the islands, I assure you. One of those citizens was Supervisor Manuel C. Pacheco, then acting mayor of Honolulu. The charges by Mr. Ickes in effect were that he didn't like how five families controlled the economy of the Territory. Acting Mayor Pacheco then wrote or wired to President Truman and informed him in effect that, it was about time that the myth of a Big Five in Hawaii was dispelled, and so forth. It was not long after that that Mr. Ickes made a complete about face and came forth with favorable comment in favor of statehood for Hawaii. This may be one of the reasons why your committee is here today. To say the least, this is all very confusing to our people, and they don't know where to turn on the question of statehood.

Another reason why I think that our people are split up on the question, is all this talk about bloc voting. If our American citizens of Japanese ancestry, residents of the Territory, have proven and have been accepted once and for all as loyal Americans and are conceded the right to vote, will they be given to understand that they are not to cast their votes for any candidate that may appeal to them? Isn't this interfering with a citizen's right to vote for the candidate of his choice? Mind you, I am not the least bit in favor of bloc voting, but I believe it happens just the same in many parts of the United States and here in Hawaii. The Italians in New York and in California I think have resorted to bloc voting, and so have the Mexicans along the border in Texas.

Chairman DELANEY. I cannot go along with you at that point. That is your point, or your opinion. I want the record to indicate that my opinion, as a New Yorker, and being familiar with the situation in New York, I know that not to be the fact. Go ahead.

Mr. ORTIZ. A great number of our members are of Japanese extraction, and they are very much confused on the question. They are all loyal Americans.

Chairman DELANEY. You heard about the plebiscite that was held here wherein a majority of 2 to 1, a majority of the people of this Territory, cast their vote for statehood?

Mr. ORTIZ. Yes.

Chairman DELANEY. Do you believe in majority rule?

Mr. ORTIZ. Yes.

Chairman DELANEY. You were here when the previous witness, Mr. Hall, testified, a few moments ago?

Mr. ORTIZ. Yes.

Chairman DELANEY. Did you hear him make a statement that in his opinion if a plebiscite were to be taken today the vote would probably be about 10 to 1?

Mr. ORTIZ. I would not be surprised if that were so.

Chairman DELANEY. You say you would not be surprised?

Mr. ORTIZ. Yes; that's right.

Chairman DELANEY. Well, then, is there any way that your organization can take a stand one way or the other, or do you want to leave it to the individual members?

Mr. ORTIZ. That is exactly what the action was, that was taken, as I stated it.

Chairman DELANEY. You are not opposed to statehood, are you?

Mr. ORTIZ. I am personally not. I am all for statehood.

Chairman DELANEY. But you say that about an equal number of your members are opposed to it?

Mr. ORTIZ. Yes; that is right.

Chairman DELANEY. Because of the fact that they do not understand it?

Mr. ORTIZ. Well, I don't know about that, whether it is that they do not understand it, but the indication at the last central council meeting, action was taken only as I said in my statement, and, as you know, since you have arrived here, everybody has been talking about statehood, and have been rushing around trying to take a stand in connection with statehood, and I was instructed to come here and to say that we were not to commit our membership right away, but my personal belief is that the majority are for statehood but I say that not as a delegate of the union, but my personal belief.

Representative MILLER. I would like the record to show that the gentleman is incorrect in one statement he made here, or in the conclusion he made, that perhaps because of Mr. Ickes' statement perhaps this committee is here. Let the record show that the plans for bringing this committee to Hawaii were made, and the records of the full committee would show, at a time, I would say, at least 2 months before Mr. Ickes even entered or made his statement. Isn't that right, Mr. Farrington and Mr. Chairman?

(Chairman Larcade resumes chair.)

Chairman LARCADE. Yes.

Delegate FARRINGTON. Yes.

Representative MILLER. The plans to come to Hawaii were started long before Mr. Ickes made his statement. Also that Mr. Ickes officially has no bearing on this committee whatsoever. Now I am very fond of Mr. Ickes—

Chairman LARCADE. So am I.

Representative MILLER. And I am not saying that disrespectfully, but I deny the charge, because I am friendly with Mr. Ickes, but I want to make it very plain to everyone that he has no more control over this committee than you apparently have over your membership.

Mr. ORTIZ. I am very glad that you made that clarification, Mr. Miller, because there has been some talk around town, and Mr. Pacheco, he took up the matter and sent a letter to Mr. Truman, and it seems as if the belief around here is that it was his action that brought you people here, but I am glad that this has come out and that we have this explanation.

Representative ANGELL. I think the record will show that a resolution was passed for this committee to come here, and that was long before Mr. Ickes made his statement, or that we had any information at all with reference to Mr. Ickes' stand.

Mr. ORTIZ. Any way you look at it, we are glad you are here.

Representative MILLER. There was some confusion as to Mr. Silverman preceding us here. Mr. Silverman is here as a representative of the Department of the Interior, serving this committee, not dictating

to it, and we asked Mr. Silverman to come here as our employee and do certain routine work for us, but not to dictate to this committee. I think that is very plain to everybody, Mr. Chairman.

Representative DELANEY. I would like unanimous consent that I be permitted to file a letter from the Honolulu Star-Bulletin transmitting a request that night session be held, and to include this request in the record, and I would suggest that the committee give consideration to the same, and announce their decision at a future session.

Chairman LARCADE. Without objection the letters will be made a part of the record.

(The letters referred to read as follows:)

HONOLULU STAR-BULLETIN,
January 8, 1946.

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE,
Chairman, House Territories Subcommittee
Investigating Statehood for Hawaii.

DEAR MR. LARCADE: I enclose herewith letter received this morning by the Honolulu Star-Bulletin requesting that a night hearing or hearings be scheduled so that people who work by day can attend, listen in, and, if they desire, appear before the committee.

Yours truly,

RILEY H. ALLEN, *Editor*.

(Enclosure.)

LETTERS FROM THE PEOPLE

HONOLULU, T. H., January 8, 1946.

The EDITOR,
Honolulu Star-Bulletin.

DEAR SIR. I would like to file my protest against the statehood schedule as outlined, by some officials, in your Monday evening paper and further make the following suggestion in revising the statehood hearing.

As the statehood schedule stands there is no time and room or even consideration given for the average citizens (who work by day) of our community, except the Government officials and others of such high caliber and status to make their testimony before the congressional committee on statehood.

Therefore, feeling the schedule is "Sardine" I would recommend at this time that night hearing be scheduled, open and conducted for the average citizens of our community.

Whether such scheduled testimony will be for or against statehood is of no importance, but let us give the same opportunities of expressing opinion to these forgotten group of citizens, in a democratic way.

Very truly yours,

RICHARD M. KAGEYAMA,
3d Supply Platoon, 3190th Engineer Service Battalion,
APO 958, Care Postmaster, San Francisco.

(Mr. Ortiz is excused.)

Representative TAYLOR. I move to recess to tomorrow morning, at 10 o'clock.

Chairman LARCADE. We will adjourn at this time, and reconvene here at 10 o'clock tomorrow.

(Meeting adjourned at 4:15 p. m., until 10 a. m. Wednesday, January 9, 1946.)

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 9, 1946

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE TERRITORIES,
Iolani Palace, Honolulu, T. H.

The committee met at 10 a. m., Hon. Henry D. Larcade (chairman) presiding.

Chairman LARCADE. The committee will please come to order. I am going to yield the chair this morning to my colleague, the gentleman from Oregon, Mr. Angell.

(Mr. Angell takes the chair.)

Mr. ANGELL. We will come to order. Judge Robertson, will you call your first witness?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I'd like to hand you six copies of a memorandum which is headed, "List of Exhibits for Hearing on Statehood." This contains an index to the volume of exhibits that was handed in here in connection with Governor Stainback's statement. If each member could have one of these he would then possess an index to that large exhibit. [Refers to exhibits Nos. 1 to 15, inclusive.]

Chairman ANGELL. Very well.

Mr. ROBERTSON. We now present Mr. Robert H. Lloyd, chairman of the Hawaii Housing Authority.

Mr. LLOYD. Good morning, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I appear before you this morning—

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Lloyd, will you first state, please, to the committee who you are and what your background and qualifications are in making your proposed statement?

Mr. LLOYD. Yes, sir. My name is Robert H. Lloyd. I am chairman of the Hawaii Housing Authority. I am appearing before you this morning to present a résumé of what the housing authority has done since its creation by the legislature of the Territory. It's my feeling that the question of housing, particularly public housing, is one common to many of the States. What we have done here, in that respect, with emphasis on public housing, I feel will permit you to be a judge of our ability to carry the same problems on, if and when we were granted statehood.

This summarized statement which I have prepared, and of which you have received copies, has been reduced to a minimum to give you a picture of what has been accomplished in the last 10 years. Now, with your permission, I would like to read this statement to you. It will take about 11 minutes, after which you can question me on any points you care to.

Chairman ANGELL. This is the statement, Mr. Lloyd, that has been handed to us?

Mr. LLOYD. No, sir, that is not the one. Mine is entitled, "Hawaii Housing Authority," at the top. Have you a copy of that before you?

Chairman ANGELL. I think not, Mr. Lloyd. I guess the chairman took the copy that was here. Perhaps there is one on my desk. I presume you are familiar with our proceedings, Mr. Lloyd, and that is, where we have a written manuscript which is of considerable length, the committee would prefer if you would hit the highlights rather than reading the manuscript, but that's a matter for you to determine. If you have a short manuscript, I presume it's satisfactory to the committee.

Mr. LLOYD. I'd much prefer to do it that way, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman ANGELL. Without objection, you may proceed.

Mr. LLOYD. Thank you. The Hawaii Housing Authority is a corporate body created by the Territorial legislature in the year 1935 to initiate, plan, construct, and manage housing projects for families of low income in conjunction with other governmental agencies, and to provide safe and sanitary dwelling units in place of slum areas.

Development and assistance contracts were entered into between the United States Housing Authority, since superseded by the Federal Public Housing Authority, and the Hawaii Housing Authority for the construction of four projects, three of which were to be located in Honolulu and one in Hilo.

The first Honolulu project, known as Kamehameha Homes and consisting of 221 permanent family dwellings, was completed and occupied in 1940. The second project, Kalakaua Homes, consisting of 140 permanent family dwellings, was 80 percent completed on December 7, 1941. Immediately after Pearl Harbor, a large number of families were evacuated from critical areas by the military authorities, and many of these were housed in Kalakaua Homes. This was a temporary measure as many of these families were ineligible; however, this situation continued throughout most of the four war years.

The construction of the largest project, the Mayor Wright Homes, to consist of 368 permanent units, in two- and three-story buildings, had reached the stage where the site had already been acquired and plans prepared when the war came. In accordance with instructions from the Federal Public Housing Authority, all construction was deferred until after the war. In the 4-year war period the local authority was therefore forced to continue in the role of a tenement landlord. It is a pleasure to be able to report that this project is now being reopened, and we have every hope of seeing actual slum clearance under way during the next 12 months. I might say, in regard to that statement, that we have just entered a contract with a local contractor actually to begin demolition of the first tenement in that slum area this week.

The fourth project, known as Lanakila Homes, to consist of 90 permanent units, is to be located in Hilo. We have already acquired the site, but here again we were held up by the war.

With the excessive shortage of housing in Honolulu during the war years certain temporary projects were consummated. Governor Ingram M. Stainback ordered the Hawaii Housing Authority to take over and manage as housing projects various evacuation camps orig-

inally constructed by the OCD. These camps in Palolo and Kalihi provide temporary shelter for 276 families. Sanitary facilities were not designed for permanent tenancy, and we are closing one of the Kalihi units housing 40 families.

In addition to the above, the Territory purchased 11 two-bedroom cottages which were on Damon Tract land condemned by the Navy. These units were moved to other land in Kalihi and the original tenants saved from eviction. Shortly after this the Governor authorized the allocation of funds to construct 50 two-bedroom cottages in the Vineyard-Kapalama area on land owned by the Bishop estate and leased to the Territory for \$1 per year.

Housing conditions were still worsening with the influx of mainland war workers and urgent appeals were forwarded to the National Housing Agency and others in Washington. This resulted in the allotment of certain Lanham Act funds for the construction of 248 temporary family units for in-migrant civilian war workers. This project, known as the Kalihi War Homes, was completed in February 1945. This Authority allotted 105 dwelling units each to civilian employees of the Army and Navy, the remaining 38 units being reserved for others engaged in essential war work in Honolulu. The Federal Public Housing Authority regulations for tenancy in this project required that the applicant be an in-migrant civilian war worker. Now, however, eligibility for war housing projects embraces the following three groups: Families of honorably discharged veterans, servicemen in distressed housing circumstances and in-migrant civilian war workers in essential industries, the latter based upon a list prepared in conjunction with the United States Employment Service.

Shortly after this the Federal Public Housing Authority allotted \$5,000,000 to the local authority to construct 1,000 permanent type housing units to be used for the duration by war workers, but to revert to low-income family housing after the war. A 200-acre site was agreed upon and tentative approval received from both the Army and the Navy. This project was to be known as Halawa War Homes. However, after survey and planning work was already advanced, the Navy Department in Washington suddenly decided that the Halawa site was essential for the further expansion of Pearl Harbor. To prevent the possible loss of these Federal funds an immediate decision was made to select the next most acceptable site, namely, Manoa Valley.

Since Washington was now fully aware of the critical housing situation here in Honolulu, the House Naval Affairs Subcommittee on Congested Areas under the chairmanship of Ed. V. Izac, came to Hawaii and made a personal investigation. Based on their findings, immediate authorization for the programming of 5,000 temporary war homes was approved. The first 1,000 units were to be constructed on the Manoa site, which project was named Manoa War Homes. These are being built with Lanham Act funds which are expendable for war purposes only. The units are therefore not permanent and must be removed within a stipulated time after the end of the war emergency.

The first unit in this project was occupied on November 21, 1945. Up to the present time the contractors have delivered to the Author-

ity 188 dwelling units all of which are occupied. Of this number 65 units have been assigned to veterans' families and 25 to distressed families of servicemen.

The recent end of the war in the Pacific has resulted in the cancellation of all contract work on the remaining 4,000 units of this major program.

During the last 12 months and to relieve the immediate critical need for housing, the Territory allotted sufficient funds to construct 362 multiple family units on the Palolo golf course. These are known as the Palolo War Homes. Construction has been completed, and these temporary housing units are occupied by distressed Honolulu families.

Summarizing the above, it should be noted that your local housing authority has initiated, programed, and acquired either by construction or by directive of the Governor a total of 2,308 housing units, plus a total of 458 additional units which are again in the planning stage, loan and annual contribution agreements having already been approved by the Federal Public Housing Authority.

Honolulu is still confronted with a critical housing shortage which poses new problems for all the interested agencies. The end of the war brought an end to war housing as such. Further low-income housing by definition in the Federal statutes is limited to families having a combined net annual income of approximately \$2,000. With high wartime wages still in effect, there are very few families eligible for this type of housing.

Since the need for housing appears to be in the middle income group, the solution must come from the proper use of private capital. Congress has never appropriated funds for this purpose, but it has under advisement new legislation directed toward urban redevelopment. In this field Congress can help local governmental agencies with funds for planning urban redevelopment projects leading toward the elimination of blighted areas, which after intelligent rezoning will permit private capital to initiate construction of housing which will not only improve the community but which will provide a fair return on the investment.

The Hawaii Housing Authority in conjunction with the city planning commission is presently studying this subject of urban redevelopment. More will be heard of it in the near future.

The Hawaii Housing Authority is now consulting with the Territorial tax commissioner and the board of health with a view to obtaining a survey of present housing conditions, particularly on the island of Oahu.

A preliminary report has been prepared indicating the data required by the above agencies, together with the estimated cost of the survey, which report is now under consideration. The findings obtained from this census will enable the Authority intelligently to program an application for additional postwar housing for families of low income.

That completes my report, Mr. Chairman. This morning I had prepared an additional exhibit, which I thought would be of interest to the committee. I believe you have received copies of it. It's entitled "Racial Extraction of Families Living in Project." This is Kamehameha Homes. [Exhibit No. 35.]

Chairman ANGELL. You may submit that for the record, Mr. Lloyd, if there are no objections. Any questions?

Representative LARCADE. I'd like to ask the witness a question, Mr. Chairman. Do you have any special sections in the city of various blocks where they congregate together as a race, in their housing?

Mr. LLOYD. There is a tendency in some sections for racial groups to build and congregate, although it's, I might say, not definitely marked. That is, I could take you to parts of Honolulu where there would be a predominantly Chinese-American population. The same thing could be true of the Japanese. But the general built-up section is pretty much a cross section of the population as a whole. I might mention the exhibit that I just referred to, shows how 221 families in one project are rather well mixed.

Representative LARCADE. That answers my question. Thank you, sir.

Chairman ANGELL. Are there any ordinances or other public regulations requiring segregation of racial groups?

Mr. LLOYD. None to my knowledge.

Chairman ANGELL. Any further questions?

Representative MILLER. Are there any unoccupied public housing dwellings here now?

Mr. LLOYD. If there are, I am not aware of it. I have a waiting list of no mean moment for any housing that becomes vacant, and we are filling them just as rapidly as the contractors can complete the new ones.

Representative MILLER. Are there any unoccupied, or occupied houses in the military areas used by military personnel that could be transferred down and made available to nonmilitary personnel or ex-servicemen?

Mr. LLOYD. In answer to that question I would like to say this, that in connection with surplus material the Navy has intimated that there were certain barracks that might be declared in that category. They are not suitable for family dwellings at the present time. The Navy made a survey as to what it would cost to remodel those barracks, put in sanitary facilities, kitchen facilities, and have decided against doing it, possibly due to a lack of funds. They have, however, stated that these could be made available through the proper Federal channels if the proper agencies would be willing to take them over. A study is now being made as to whether we could remove those barracks from their present location on naval reservation areas to civilian areas here within the city proper, and convert them. It's my personal opinion that it is inexpedient to do so. We are faced with a shortage of labor, construction labor particularly. It would require less labor to reactivate the emergency program which the Federal Public Housing Authority instituted for 4,000 homes and then canceled, and ship prefabricated dwellings down here, and carry out that program than it would take this material from the Navy and try to reconvert it to our use. Does that answer the question?

Representative MILLER. Well, yes, it answers it, I suppose.

Chairman ANGELL. Thank you, Mr. Lloyd. We are very happy to have you before the committee. Judge Robertson, will you present the next witness?

Mr. ROBERTSON. We present Mr. Benjamin F. Rush, superintendent of public works.

Chairman ANGELL. Mr. Rush, in keeping with our policy, will you please state your qualifications and background, for whom you appear, for the purposes of the record.

Mr. RUSH. My name is Benjamin F. Rush. I am superintendent of public works, and appearing for the Territory. I am a graduate of Oregon State College, class of 1917. I spent 2 years in World War I as a private, and later as a second lieutenant in the Engineer Corps. I am a graduate in civil engineering. Two years in the United States Geological Survey here in the Territory, from which position I moved to the department of public works, and served as an engineer until 1929, and was made assistant superintendent of public works from 1929 to 33, when I became city engineer of Honolulu and served 8 years as city engineer. From that position I went into the navy as a lieutenant commander in the Civil Engineer Corps, and served until October 1943, when, at the request of the Navy I was released to take over the position as—at the request of the Governor—I was relieved to take over the position as superintendent of public works, and served up to the present time. I have been a full member of the American Society of Engineers since 1933. I have prepared a written statement, of which all of you have copies. I'll just simply glance through this and give you the high lights as I go through.

Public works here in the Territory is handled pretty much the same as it is handled in all the mainland communities, except that there is more of a tendency for the main facilities to be owned by the Territory rather than the political subdivisions. For instance, airports and dock facilities, instead of being operated by the city here are operated, owned and operated, by the Territory. Our Federal-aid highway system is practically the same as the Federal-aid highway system is operated on the mainland. The last Legislature, in view of the 1944 Federal-aid highway act, provided funds so the Territory can take advantage of the funds that are available for the construction of Federal-aid highways. They also provided \$2,000,000 to take care of war damaged highways. We were subject to very heavy traffic conditions here. Many tanks and other heavy equipment ran over our roads during the war, and our highways were damaged to an estimated amount of between 8 and 10 million dollars. So we have a revolving fund which can be used to rehabilitate those highways, the idea being, under section 10 of the Highway Act of 1941, the National Highway Act, we repair those and submit the bill to the Public Roads Administration, which in turn refers them to their recommendations to Congress, and we hope we will be able to recover some of the expenditures we will have made on the repair of these highways.

I won't cover the details here. I think that——

Delegate FARRINGTON. I think, Mr. Chairman, the statement is so brief and concise that if you want to, I would just read it if I were you.

Mr. RUSH. Would you like to have it read?

Delegate FARRINGTON. Sure.

Mr. RUSH (reading):

PUBLIC WORKS IN GENERAL

In general, the handling of public works in the Territory differs somewhat from the methods used by the various States. Public water front and shipping facilities, as well as airports, instead of being

owned and operated by cities or counties, as is the custom in many of the communities on the mainland, are here owned and operated by the Territory under the superintendent of public works.

Federal-aid highways are constructed and maintained by the Territory as is customary in the case of States on the mainland. The various counties maintain all city streets and public roads which have not been improved by the Territory in cooperation with the Federal Public Roads Administration.

HIGHWAYS

Federal-aid for the construction of highways was first made available to the Territory in the year 1925. From that date up to the beginning of the war, there had been constructed a total of 307 miles on the various islands of the Hawaiian group at a total cost of \$16,451,000.

During the war period and up to the end of 1945, the activities of the highway division of the department were given over entirely to the problem of maintaining our roads in passable condition for use of the military activities and the public and the construction of 46 miles of roads needed for access to military installations. The 46 miles of military access roads mentioned above were constructed at a cost of \$8,112,000.

There are at present 9 miles of military access road under construction at contract prices aggregating \$1,650,000. When these 9 miles are completed, there will be 362 miles of Federal-aid highways in the Territory.

The Territory is in an excellent position to take advantage of Federal-aid funds provided by the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944. The 1945 Territorial legislature passed legislation which allows the Territory to use all of the 4 cents gasoline tax collected, except that on gasoline used in aeroplanes, for construction and maintenance of Federal-aid highways.

The 1945 legislature also provided a revolving fund in the amount of \$2,000,000 to be used for the rehabilitation of war-damaged highways and streets. When this rehabilitation is complete and the Territory is reimbursed by the Federal Government, as provided by section 10 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941, the \$2,000,000 becomes available for matching Federal aid.

Public roads in the entire Territory are tabulated as follows:

	<i>Miles</i>
County roads and city streets.....	1, 573
Federal-aid highways (including 9 miles under contract).....	362
Total.....	1, 935

In addition to the above, there are approximately 100 miles of roads in parks and military reservations which are federally owned and 214 miles of improved private roads on plantations. County road maintenance and construction is financed from the weight tax on automobiles and from general taxation.

AIRPORTS

Before I get to airports, I would like to say that the Territory maintains all highways on which Federal-aid funds have been expended. The counties maintain all other roads. Our maintenance

funds come from the gasoline tax, and the maintenance funds of the counties come from the weight tax, plus some addition from general taxation.

Chairman ANGELL. What is the gas tax, what rate?

Mr. RUSH. The gas tax is 4 cents, Territorial. That's also on airplane gas. The funds from the airplane gas tax are used to maintain airports.

Chairman ANGELL. You may recall that our State of Oregon was the first State in the Union to adopt the gas tax.

Mr. RUSH. That's right.

Chairman ANGELL. It was a serious question at that time whether it was constitutional, and had to be taken to the United States Supreme Court.

Mr. RUSH (continues reading):

Prior to the beginning of the war with Japan, the Territory had in operation on the various islands eight airports. There were John Rodgers Airport on Oahu; the Hilo and Upolu Airports on Hawaii; the Maui and Hana Airports on Maui; the Molokai and Kalaupapa Airports on Molokai; and the Port Allen Airports on Kauai. These airports had flight strips from 2,500 to 4,500 feet in length.

In cooperation with the United States Civil Aeronautics Administration, a large Territorial airport expansion program was just getting under way when the war with Japan interrupted its continuation under Territorial supervision. Airport improvements to the extent of slightly more than \$10,000,000 had been arranged.

After December 7, 1941, all Territorial airports were taken over by the military forces. For military protection, the airports at Hana, Maui; Kalaupapa, Molokai; and Port Allen, Kauai, were plowed up and made unusable. The Army has, however, since the cessation of hostilities, repaired both Hana and Kalaupapa Airports, which are now available for civilian use. The Army has also told us they will repair Ford Island as soon as they can get labor to do that.

During the war the John Rodgers Airport on Oahu, the Hilo Airport and Upolu Point Airport on Hawaii, the Maui Airport, and the Molokai Airport were developed by the military forces, using CAA funds, which had been previously allotted to the Territory in conjunction with funds that were available for military purposes. The work done by the military forces greatly improved the facilities which the Territory owns.

John Rodgers Airport, on Oahu, is now one of the finest in the country. It has three seaplane runways, two of which are in excess of 15,000 feet and the third is 10,500 feet; all have 10 feet deep water; runway widths are 1,000 feet. Landplane runways at this airport consist of two parallel paved main runways 7,000 feet long, one 8,000 feet long, one 6,200 feet, one 5,000 feet, together with taxiways and aprons.

The Hilo Airport has three paved runways—6,500 feet, 6,000 feet, and 3,000 feet.

The Maui Airport has two paved runways—one 7,000 feet and one 6,000 feet long.

The Molokai Airport has two paved runways of 4,200 and 3,000 feet length.

The Upolu Point Airport on the island of Hawaii has a paved runway of 4,000 feet length.

The 1945 legislature provided funds for the construction of an airport at Hana, Maui; one at Kailua, Hawaii; the paving of the airport at Kalaupapa, Molokai; the construction of an airport on the island of Lanai; and the purchase of land for the construction of an airport at Lihue, Kauai; and the additional land needed for the John Rodgers Airport. In all, there are already available Territorial funds of approximately \$1,000,000 for the further improvement of Territorial airports, when labor and material become available. It is hoped that funds now available from Territorial appropriations may be used in cooperation with funds to be provided to the Civil Aeronautics Administration through legislation now before the National Congress.

The operation and maintenance of Territorial airports is provided for by legislative act making available for this purpose all gasoline taxes collected on gasoline used in aeroplanes.

The 1945 legislature provided the necessary legislation which allows the superintendent of public works to zone the area surrounding airports for their proper protection against obsolescence due to construction which might interfere with plane operations. These zoning regulations are now in the process of preparation.

It is expected that John Rodgers Airport on Oahu will become very heavily used as soon as civilian trans-Pacific travel can be provided with the necessary planes.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

The department of public works is responsible for the maintenance and construction of all buildings provided as quarters for various departments of the Territorial government. Territorial office buildings are provided on the main island of the group, i. e., Oahu, Maui, Kauai, and Hawaii; and the major departments of the Territorial government maintain branch offices on each island.

Due to the growth of our population and the expansion of government, there is now a great need for additional government office facilities as soon as labor and material can be more readily obtained.

HARBOR FACILITIES

Harbor facilities of the Territory are administered by a board of harbor commissioners appointed by the Governor and confirmed by the Territorial senate. This board consists of five members, of which the superintendent of public works is ex-officio chairman.

This board is responsible for the management, operation, and maintenance of all public facilities provided throughout the Territory for the use of ocean shipping.

Each of the major islands of the Hawaiian group is provided with a good overseas shipping port and in addition many small harbors are maintained for interisland traffic.

The major ports of the islands are Honolulu on Oahu; Kahului on Maui; Hilo on Hawaii; and Port Allen on Kauai.

In addition to facilities provided by the Territory there are several privately owned port facilities. In Honolulu Harbor both the

Inter-Island Steam Navigation Co. and the Oahu Railway & Land Co. operate privately owned facilities. One pineapple company owns a private pier at Kolo, Molokai; another pineapple company owns a pier on Lanai Island; a pier is owned and operated by a local railroad company on Kauai at Ahukini; and a sugar company owns and operates a private landing at Mahukona, Hawaii.

As highways have been improved the tendency has been more and more to ship through one main port on each island, capable of handling overseas shipments, and except in Honolulu Harbor, the tendency has been to abandon private facilities and use those provided by the Territory.

At the 1945 session of the Territorial legislature, an act was passed which provided that all revenue collected by the harbor board is to be set up in a harbor board fund. This fund is to be used to take care of operation, maintenance, bond charges, and improvements made by the harbor board. This same act provided for the use of \$800,000 of surplus collections for the rehabilitation of all waterfront facilities which had lacked proper maintenance during the war period when facilities were subjected to very heavy usage.

Honolulu Harbor is the major port of the Territory. At this port the Territory owns piers 2, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 35, and 36. Piers 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, and 32 are privately owned. The Army owns piers 1, 5, 39, and 40, the United States Coast Guard owns pier 4 and the Navy 5-A.

The Territory owns and maintains harbor improvement with a present valuation of approximately \$20,000,000. There is an urgent need for a new freight pier in Honolulu and a new overseas pier on the island of Hawaii to take care of the freight originating in Kohala, Kona, and Waimea. I won't read the tabulations.

Representative LARCADE. Mr. Chairman, may I question the witness?

Chairman ANGELL. Certainly.

Representative LARCADE. How were the nine airports which you have mentioned, how was construction of these airports financed prior to the war?

Mr. RUSH. Prior to the war part of them were done entirely, that is, the original airports were done entirely, with Territorial funds, that is, the early airports, but just about 4 or 5 years before the war we started receiving CAA help and a great deal of that later work was done with CAA funds, that is, we furnished the administration building and the land, and the CAA funds took care of the cost of the actual construction.

Representative LARCADE. That's what I was interested in, in knowing whether or not the Federal Government had made any contribution to these nine airports prior to the war.

Mr. RUSH. They had.

Representative LARCADE. Thank you.

Chairman ANGELL. Any further questions?

Representative DELANEY. These are all owned by the Territory, is that right, all these airports?

Mr. RUSH. The airports are, well, all the public airports are owned by the Territory.

Representative DELANEY. Are there facilities available to all commercial air lines on the same terms?

Mr. RUSH. They have to be when you spend CAA funds, and they are.

Representative DELANEY. They are?

Mr. RUSH. Yes.

Representative DELANEY. And what about your docks, are they available to all steamship companies on the same terms?

Mr. RUSH. They are.

Representative DELANEY. All of them?

Mr. RUSH. The only difference—yes, they are available to all steamship companies.

Representative DELANEY. And have these publicly owned docks the same depth of water so that a sizable ship can be brought in and docked?

Mr. RUSH. The overseas docks all have the same depth of water. We have certain landings and small wharves that are used by the various interisland shipments that don't have the same depth of water. All overseas shipping has the same depth of water. There are certain small landings out on the isolated places on some of the islands where they send a small boat in to get the cargo.

Representative DELANEY. They are available to all steamship companies or any ship that might choose to stop here, on the same basis and the same terms, is that right?

Mr. RUSH. That's right.

Representative MILLER. Are the public steamship facilities for overseas shipping by big ships. How do they compare with the privately owned docking facilities here?

Mr. RUSH. Well, of course practically all the overseas shipping—how they compare, that was the question?

Representative MILLER. In other words, you mentioned that there are numbers of docks here that are privately owned. I presume that, for instance, the Matson Line owns its own docks. Well, how do the Matson docks compare with the docks that the President Lines use?

Mr. RUSH. Most of them are a combination of a passenger pier and a freight pier. The privately owned docks, although they do take passengers, are built primarily for freight shipment. The freight shipment, the sugar goes out here, most of it, over privately owned docks. A great deal of pineapple crop goes out over privately owned docks. For that reason those docks are built more for freight shipment than ours are.

Representative MILLER. Thank you.

Chairman ANGELL. What is the prevailing depth of water for these overseas docks?

Mr. RUSH. Our department in Honolulu Harbor, and all the overseas docks on the outlying islands is 35 feet, although the channel in the Honolulu Harbor is maintained at 45 feet by the United States engineers.

Chairman ANGELL. Any further questions?

Representative TAYLOR. Any diversion of the 4-cent gasoline tax for any other purpose than the reconstruction or building of highways?

Mr. RUSH. There isn't now.

Representative TAYLOR. Was there prior to 1944?

Mr. RUSH. Yes.

Representative TAYLOR. Has there been a survey completed and submitted to Mr. McDonald, of the Public Roads Administration, show-

ing the damage that has been caused to the Territory as a result of transport over your highways?

Mr. RUSH. Yes, we have made that report.

Representative TAYLOR. Have you any idea of what the estimate is?

Mr. RUSH. The estimate that we have made up is around \$8,000,000. It includes both the Territorial roads and the county roads. There may be some roads in that estimate that they will not recognize as being damaged by the military, in which case that amount would be reduced, that is, that the Public Roads Administration will approve as being damaged by the military.

Representative TAYLOR. Well, your county highways, are they roads for which you can properly make an estimate so that you can be reimbursed for whatever damage has been done to them?

Mr. RUSH. Well, section 10 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941 provides that those repairs must be made, and then we submit the bill of the actual cost. We have to finance the repair cost. We have made an estimate of what it will cost, but the actual cost will depend entirely on what the contract prices are. We are doing it all by contract, so there can't be any question of cost.

Representative TAYLOR. Did you receive any money here for access highways?

Mr. RUSH. Oh, yes, we built about 46 miles of access highways, and there is about \$10,000,000 spent on access highways.

Representative TAYLOR. To what kind of strategic materials did those highways lead?

Mr. RUSH. They weren't to strategic materials so much as to military installations, where they built new encampments, and we had to build a road to get in and out.

Representative TAYLOR. Did the Government build any highways of their own?

Mr. RUSH. They did, a few Federal highways.

Chairman ANGELL. Have those new highways become a part of your highway system, and will they be maintained in the future?

Mr. RUSH. They will. Most of the access highways are. Well, they are so used by the public here, in addition to being used by the military government, military forces.

Chairman ANGELL. Thank you, Mr. Rush. We appreciate your statement.

Delegate FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, before the next witness proceeds, I'd like to say that our permanent chairman, Mr. Larcade, has raised a question as to whether or not the testimony will cover the operation of other forms of transportation and their control, such as railroads, streetcar lines, and shipping, and I would like to ask the counsel for the commission if their plans contemplate presenting that subject.

Mr. ROBERTSON. To cover the subject of interisland transportation by air and by sea, and likewise the transportation by air and sea between here and the Pacific coast.

Chairman ANGELL. How about railroads?

Delegate FARRINGTON. I think that Mr. Larcade has in mind completing the record on other forms of transportation within the territory itself, and introducing in addition some testimony as to the method the Territory employs for regulating that transportation.

Representative LARCADE. Well, it's public utilities.

Delegate FARRINGTON. That's right.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Well, we can cover that. There is a small railroad on this island, and there is a small railroad on the island of Hawaii. We can cover that subject, if the committee desires. [See exhibit 55, exhibit 6j, and statement No. 10.]

Delegate FARRINGTON. I think that is the wish of some of the members, in order that the record be very complete.

Chairman ANGELL. Very well, if there is no objection. Judge, you may proceed.

Mr. ROBERTSON. We now present Mr. A. Lester Marks, commissioner of public lands.

Mr. MARKS. I have not, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, prepared a historical—

Chairman ANGELL. Will you state your background and qualifications?

Mr. MARKS. I will be very pleased to. I am A. Lester Marks, commissioner of public lands. I was born in the Territory of Hawaii and educated in the public schools here, through high school. I am a graduate of Cornell University, and have practiced engineering and contracting in the Territory. I have been commissioner of public lands since May 1943. Under my jurisdiction the public land office, the survey department, the taxation maps bureau, and the division of hydrography are all grouped. I have not prepared a historical statement of the lands of Hawaii, because I think that those have been thoroughly covered in the former hearings. I have, however, brought up the statistical charts that have appeared in the former hearings, and brought them up to December 31, 1945, showing the classifications, various classifications, and holdings of the lands in the Territory. I have also prepared—

Representative LARCADE. Mr. Chairman, at this point I suggest that the witness be permitted to file for the record this exhibit.

Chairman ANGELL. That may be done, without objection.

(A document was here submitted and received by the committee as exhibit 36A.)

Mr. MARKS. I also have prepared some statistical charts showing the areas and land holdings of the Territory in its entirety and also have broken it up, showing the holdings in the various islands. These charts—I am also leaving them with the committee. Sheet 1 shows the entire Territory, and a private ownership of 57 percent of the land. Sheet 2 breaks it up into the various islands, which shows private ownership of varying from the island of Niihau, which has 72 square miles and is entirely privately owned, to the island of Kahoolawe, which has 44 square miles and is entirely owned by the Territory, and the other islands being somewhere in between those two limits. [Exhibits 36 B, C, D.]

Chairman ANGELL. What is the total in public ownership in the Territory?

Mr. MARKS. The total land?

Chairman ANGELL. Public ownership of any kind—Federal, local, county, city.

Mr. MARKS. The public is 1,535,000 acres. That is shown on the sheet that I—

Chairman ANGELL. And the private?

Mr. MARKS. 2,356,000 acres.

Chairman ANGELL. You may proceed.

Mr. MARKS. I feel, with this brief statement, that if there is any particular phase of the land ownership that any of the committee would care to have me accentuate, I would be very glad to go into that.

Representative LARCADE. Well, Mr. Chairman, taking advantage of the offer of the witness, I would like him to elaborate upon the ownership of the sugarcane lands. I understand that part of them are owned in fee simple by various corporations, and others are leased by the corporations. I think it would be interesting to the committee to have comments for the record in that respect.

Mr. MARKS. The sugar industry, in the growing of cane, is mostly done by corporations. It is a large-scale enterprise, and needs considerable capital. A majority of the sugar holdings are privately owned. There are, however, some Territorial leases which are in one location on Kikaha, is located almost entirely on leased land, and it is leased. The percentage of leased land on the rest of them varies considerably.

Representative LARCADE. What is the character of the ownership of this leased land? Who owns it? Various citizens, or other corporations?

Mr. MARKS. Mostly various citizens. These locations of the plantations are such that they will embrace a large number of our ahupuaa—which is the major grant to the chief—and a plantation starting in business will have a number of those. They have both, some of them, but others are still in the ownership of the descendants of the original grantee, and those are operated by the sugar plantation.

Representative LARCADE. What is the established practice with respect to the term of the leases, and for how long a term were the leases usually granted?

Mr. MARKS. Under the organic act the Territory is limited to 15 years for agricultural lands.

Representative LARCADE. Citizens are not limited?

Mr. MARKS. There is no limitation on private land.

Representative LARCADE. What is the usual term, established practice, in that respect—10, 20, 30, 50, 99 years?

Mr. MARKS. More generally it would be a 21-year lease. Some of them go up to 30. Some of them go up to 50, but I believe that a 21-year lease is the more accepted length of tenure.

Chairman ANGELL. How is the rental arranged?

Mr. MARKS. Between private individuals it's a matter of horse trading. In renting the public lands we endeavor to establish a formula, so that the rental will be a percentage of the profit. We have an upset rental and an auxiliary rental, based upon the gross receipts from the commodity raised upon the land.

Chairman ANGELL. Any further questions?

Representative DELANEY. Yes—I have here a publication I found on my desk as I arrived here this morning. [See Exhibit No. 47.] It's compiled by Representative Hal Hanna. In it he states that the people of the Territory of Hawaii own only 8.7 percent—by people he's referring to the masses. Do you know whether or not that statement is substantially true?

Mr. MARKS. I personally have not checked it up.

Representative DELANEY. Well, I don't want an accurate check. I said substantially true.

Mr. MARKS. I believe that it is.

Representative DELANEY. Yes. Now, all right, do you feel, as a public official, that that reflects a healthy attitude in this community—yes or no?

Mr. MARKS. I feel that I can't answer you yes or no. I can answer your question, but I feel that it is in the category——

Representative DELANEY. It is a simple question, and understandable. Do you feel that is a healthy question for the people of Hawaii—yes or no?

Mr. MARKS. May I ask you again, what the——

Representative DELANEY. You are not able to answer my question yes or no, is that right?

Mr. MARKS. I think that is right, in its present form.

Representative DELANEY. All right. I'd like to hear your explanation.

Mr. MARKS. The landholdings in Hawaii vary from a few acres up to—there is one—the Parker ranch has almost 500,000 acres in its control, and whether it is a healthy or unhealthy division is a matter that I cannot answer without knowing more of the statistics upon which Mr. Hanna based his article. I have not seen his article.

Representative DELANEY. I'll try and clear the situation up. Does the land shortage exist for those who would build a home here?

Mr. MARKS. On some of the islands it definitely does.

Representative DELANEY. On this island?

Mr. MARKS. It definitely does.

Representative DELANEY. Now, you say you have something to do with taxation, is that right?

Mr. MARKS. No, sir.

Representative DELANEY. You have nothing to do with taxation.

Mr. MARKS. I have nothing to do with taxation.

Mr. DELANEY. Are you familiar with the assessed valuation of unimproved property?

Mr. MARKS. I am.

Representative DELANEY. I noticed in the newspaper the other day some advertisements offering for sale unimproved property. I ask you whether or not assessed valuations of this unimproved property are in keeping with the sales price?

Mr. MARKS. At present it is not.

Representative DELANEY. It's way out of bounds, is that right?

Mr. MARKS. I would say in general that the sales price of property at present is three to four times the assessed value.

Representative DELANEY. Has any recommendation been made to assess this unimproved property at the price that it's now offered to the public for sale?

Mr. MARKS. I could not answer that.

Representative DELANEY. What effort has been made here to protect the men who desire to build homes so that they can acquire a piece of property at a reasonable value?

Mr. MARKS. I know of none.

Representative DELANEY. No effort?

Mr. MARKS. Except, if I may continue, that the tax office revalues property in cycles of 4 years, and an endeavor is made by them to keep up as far as practical with the current prices of real estate.

Representative DELANEY. Do you know whether an effort has been made to appraise property at the price offered for sale in the public newspapers?

Mr. MARKS. I know of no such efforts.

Representative DELANEY. Do you know of any reason why it shouldn't be done?

Mr. MARKS. The matter of mechanics would come in there. We have had a decided shortage of housing. We have had, with the Army and Navy occupying so much of the land on this island and occupying the land which was in the past of potential developments, has put an artificial inflation on both land and building.

Representative DELANEY. As a public official, you are interested in relieving a housing shortage, is that right, and as a citizen of Hawaii?

Mr. MARKS. Not as a public official, but as an individual citizen I will do anything I can.

Representative DELANEY. You are interested in the welfare of a great majority of the people of this Territory, is that right?

Mr. MARKS. I am.

Representative DELANEY. What effort has been made to provide these people with land so that they could relieve the house shortage, with land at reasonable figures?

Mr. MARKS. I know of no land that is for sale at reasonable figures.

Representative DELANEY. Do I understand that one estate—the Bishop estate—owns about approximately 11 percent of the land, is that right?

Mr. MARKS. That is correct.

Representative DELANEY. And that estate owns more than all the masses of this community combined?

Mr. MARKS. I believe that is correct.

Representative DELANEY. That's all.

Chairman ANGELL. Any further questions?

Mr. ROBERTSON. May I ask a question?

Chairman ANGELL. Yes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Referring to the Bishop estate, Mr. Marks, what are the respective qualities of this large area of land that is owned by the Bishop estate?

Mr. MARKS. They have all manner of land. Some of it is forest and waste land, some of it is cane land, some of it urban, and some of it is rural.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Well, a large proportion of this acreage of the Bishop estate consists of mountaintops and lava flows on the island of Hawaii, does it not?

Mr. MARKS. That is correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON. In other words, pure waste?

Mr. MARKS. Some of it.

Representative DELANEY. Do I understand that the Bishop estate has no land that could be used for homesite?

Mr. MARKS. I would not say that.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Referring to the present high selling prices of urban land here in Honolulu, compared with its assessed value, since when has that condition come up?

Mr. MARKS. The great increase has been since the war.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Since 1941?

Mr. MARKS. Since 1941.

Mr. ROBERTSON. And since 1941 has there been any practical opportunity for anybody to build or improve real estate?

Mr. MARKS. I have known of none.

Mr. ROBERTSON. In other words, things have necessarily been at a standstill since December 7, 1941, is that right?

Mr. MARKS. That is correct. We have been in——

Representative LARCADE. Mr. Chairman, at this point may I ask the witness a question?

Chairman ANGELL. We'll take a recess for 10 minutes. The cross-examination seems to be extending—if that is agreeable. You may complete the answer to that question and we'll recess.

Mr. MARKS. I was about to state that, elaborate a little bit on my previous statement that the Army and Navy have taken over sites not only that were the potential areas for development, but some that had already been settled upon, and the people were evicted from them, and when you originally do not have enough areas or housing for these people it puts a considerable premium upon those that are remaining.

Representative DELANEY. And that would create an additional housing shortage?

Mr. MARKS. We have had an absolute housing shortage.

Representative DELANEY. Nothing has been done to relieve that situation?

Mr. MARKS. The Federal Government has been endeavoring for 3 or 4 years to put houses on our public parks. We have turned over public parks, and with the power of the Federal Government to bring material and labor down here, nothing of any lasting importance has been accomplished as yet.

Chairman ANGELL. The committee will recess for 10 minutes to give the reporter a chance.

(A recess was taken at this point until 11:30 a. m.)

Chairman ANGELL. The meeting will come to order and we will proceed.

Representative LARCADE. I had intended asking the witness a question prior to the recess. With respect to the colloquy which developed between you and Judge Robertson during your testimony, I would like to find out what was the situation prior to the war. Of course we understand that on account of the war the Army and Navy took over all the installations or land or other property that was necessary for the war, and as a result of that, with the advent of thousands of soldiers and workers here, naturally property values increased in value, and that there was no land available for housing or for development of any kind. But I'd like to know what was the situation prior to December 7, 1941, in that respect.

Mr. MARKS. The land was not plentiful, although the development and trend of the city of Honolulu was toward Pearl Harbor. Tracts

were being opened up in that direction, some of them on leaseholds, and some of them in fee simple. But the shoe really started to pinch when the Army and the Navy and the civilian employees were brought down here and had to be housed. When they arrived the shoe started to pinch.

Representative LARCADE. We realize that, but I am trying to get an expression from you as to what was the situation prior to that time in respect to the question that was asked by Mr. Delaney.

Mr. MARKS. Land was for sale.

Representative LARCADE. Land was available?

Mr. MARKS. Land was available, but not plentiful. You have to take into consideration that we are surrounded by ocean, and we do not have large areas adjacent to the present urban areas that can be converted to housing. I would like, Mr. Chairman, to amplify one of the statements I made to Mr. Delaney, if it is permissible.

Chairman ANGELL. You may do so.

Mr. MARKS. In regard to house lots, Mr. Delaney, the land department has been putting them on the market just as rapidly as we can lay our hands on them. We have not put any on that did not have roads and water going to them, but on each of the islands we have been marketing house lots constantly, and as rapidly as we could get them into shape. I would also like to speak of taxes. Although the taxes are not in my department, I have been interested in them, and have cooperated at various times with the tax office. We are valued on a 4-year cycle. The 4-year cycle came up as of January 1, 1941, and—I'll correct that—1942—and as that was less than a month after the blitz, the tax office was not able to set any definite valuations as of that date, and we in general carried over the valuations of the previous 4-year cycle. If you were here on January 1, 1942, you would appreciate that there was no such thing as land values. A lot of people would give you their land for a trip to the mainland, and there were other people who were a little more hearty and thought this place would not be taken, and who were paying substantial values.

You mentioned the Bishop estate. I hold no brief for the Bishop estate, but I would like to state here that is an eleemosynary trust. The benefits accruing to it are used for Kamehameha School, and whether or not more good is accruing to the people in general through their stewardship of these holdings I am not in a position to say. I merely mention it, however, to bring out that this is not a private enterprise that I am discussing.

Chairman ANGELL. Is it a corporation, the Bishop estate?

Mr. MARKS. No; it is not.

Chairman ANGELL. Are the properties owned entirely by this trust?

Mr. MARKS. They are.

Chairman ANGELL. And for what purposes are the incomes devoted?

Mr. MARKS. The incomes are devoted to Kamehameha School, which is to educate the Hawaiians. [See exhibit No. 69.]

Chairman ANGELL. Is that a grammar school, or what sort of school is it?

Mr. MARKS. It's a grammar school. They give some high-school courses and some trade courses.

Chairman ANGELL. Are there any further questions?

Representative MILLER. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman ANGELL. Mr. Miller.

Representative MILLER. In answer—or, Mr. Delaney asked the question about the Bishop estate owning all of this land on the island of Kauai, I believe. The point was brought out that most of it was not very good land; is that correct? The judge asked that question and you answered it. Now, I have only glanced at the map of the country, but I notice there are two mountain tops. I don't know whether it embraces both of them or not; does it?

Mr. MARKS. It does not embrace the entire mountain top. It consists of a number of these ahupuaa. The Bishop estate, Bernice Pauahi Bishop was more or less the focal point of the concentration of a number of these grants that I mentioned, called ahupuaas, that were granted to the chiefs, and when she died she left this trust estate.

Representative MILLER. Well, I notice in this break-down, and I haven't any way of knowing whether the part, or the island of Hawaii is right or not, there is one relative to Oahu, it's taken from the records of June 8, from A. H. Landgraf, Jr., assistant assessor. Assuming that this one is at least somewhat correct, it shows that 527,000-odd acres, or 20.44 percent of the land, comes under the commissioner of public lands on Hawaii; is that correct?

Mr. MARKS. I believe it is; yes.

Representative MILLER. And that other Territorial lands amount to about 456,000, or a total of about 39.13 percent of the land. What is the nature of the land controlled by the commissioner and the other Territorial departments on the island? Is it good, arable land, or is it some mountain top, too?

Mr. MARKS. The lands remaining under the commissioner of public lands are mostly leavings. If I might explain that, originally the entire area belonged to the King. In the great Mahele concessions were made to the chiefs, and roughly a third of the land was given to them, and in turn certain areas were given to the common people, the areas that they lived on, free holdings. After that the Territory went through a period in which homesteading was tried, and a considerable amount of the land was taken out of the public domain and homesteaded. That was followed by the organization of the Hawaiian Homes Commission, and turning over to them some 200,000 acres of land there, so that the land remaining as public land, and the term "public land" is rather academic, inasmuch as land taken out for forestry is not classed as public land. The land remaining in public land is not, I would say, the choice land.

Representative MILLER. I see. So then the land remaining in public land, that 39 percent and the 11 percent, 35 percent in the Bishop estate, or roughly 49 percent, accounts for most of the bad lands on the island of Hawaii, I take it?

(No response.)

Representative MILLER. That is the nonarable land that isn't too good for settlement?

Mr. MARKS. No; some of that land of the Bishop estate is good land.

Representative MILLER. I know, but I mean, when we get through this 49.5 percent, or almost half of it, the Bishop estate land and

the commissioner of public works and other Territorial departments, we have accounted for most of the mountain tops and most of the bad land on the island, is that correct?

Mr. MARKS. You are speaking of the island of Hawaii?

Representative MILLER. Of Hawaii.

Mr. MARKS. I do not have it broken down that fine.

Representative MILLER. Well, then, I'll get right to the point I wanted to make. Now tell us something about the Parker ranch, which contains 13 percent of the land on the island. Is it bad land too, or have we still got more bad land on the island, or have we eliminated, through the Bishop estate, most of the bad land? How about the Parker ranch, 13 percent, or—

Mr. MARKS. Our bad lands are not concentrated. We have had lava flows that will come down on all sides of the islands and destroyed thousands of acres. There are other portions of this land that have no water, up at an elevation of 12,000, 13,000 feet.

Representative MILLER. You haven't got much at an elevation of 13,000 feet?

Mr. MARKS. Yes; we have—

Representative MILLER. I thought we took care of that mostly in the Bishop lands. I come from a mountainous State too, and we speak of a 13,000 feet, but after you get down to around 5,000 or 6,000 feet you come into lands that can be used for cattle raising and other purposes. We have lava, too, a lot of it, I might say.

Mr. MARKS. There are relatively few of these lands that will not support some cattle, and so we have no—

Representative MILLER. What percentage of the Parker estate, then, and that's not an eleemosynary trust, is it?

Mr. PARKS. No; it is not.

Representative MILLER. What part of the Parker estate, or Parker ranch, what percentage of its 339,000 acres is good land that would support small holdings, do you think?

Mr. MARKS. I imagine that perhaps 15,000 acres might be, with proper water development.

Representative MILLER. Out of the 339,000?

Mr. MARKS. I believe that that would be. However, that is an offhand segregation. I have no figures to support that.

Representative DELANEY. There is some land that you would consider good for home sites, is that right, in these Territories?

Mr. MARKS. Absolutely.

Representative DELANEY. What proportion of the land of the Territories would you consider could be used for home sites?

Mr. MARKS. You have reference, Mr. Delaney, to just the home site, not a homestead?

Representative DELANEY. That's right. Approximately, now, we don't want to go into figures.

Mr. MARKS. I don't believe I could answer that.

Representative DELANEY. But a great portion of this Territory could be used—

Mr. MARKS. It could.

Representative DELANEY. And a very small portion is available to the people who desire to purchase it at a reasonable value, is that right?

Mr. MARKS. On the island of Oahu that is absolutely so, but on the other islands it diminishes, and land is not difficult to get on the other islands.

Representative DELANEY. Do I understand you to say that on each of the islands some land is offered for sale to those who desire to establish home sites?

Mr. MARKS. It is.

Representative DELANEY. On all islands?

Mr. MARKS. On all islands in which there is government land.

Representative DELANEY. Well, now, yesterday were you here when one of the gentlemen testified as to the island, I believe, of Lanai?

Mr. MARKS. Lanai.

Representative DELANEY. You will pardon my pronunciation. Were you present?

Mr. MARKS. I was not.

Representative DELANEY. Well, if I were to tell you that that gentleman testified that that land was wholly owned by a private corporation, would you say that statement was true or not true?

Mr. MARKS. I would say it is true.

Representative DELANEY. Then there is not land available on all of the islands for those who desire to purchase it, is there?

Mr. MARKS. If that—if you are referring to private lands, I—it is not.

Representative DELANEY. It is not true?

Mr. MARKS. No.

Representative DELANEY. There are——

Mr. MARKS. Lands are available.

Representative DELANEY. There are some islands in this group, if a man is ready and willing and able to buy land, and satisfied to buy it, that he cannot purchase because no land is available?

Mr. MARKS. That is true.

Representative DELANEY. I believe you are interested in the welfare of this community, are you not?

Mr. MARKS. I believe I qualify to that.

Representative DELANEY. Do you feel that run-away inflation would be injurious to the general welfare of the community?

Mr. MARKS. I do.

Representative DELANEY. What has been done on the part of the assessors of this Territory to assess the value of land to the offered price today?

Mr. MARKS. I would say that I know of none.

Representative DELANEY. Nothing being done?

Mr. MARKS. That is not in my department, however, Mr. Delaney.

Representative DELANEY. Now let me ask you this: Who appraises or assesses the value of land?

Mr. MARKS. The tax commissioner of the Territory of Hawaii.

Representative DELANEY. How were these men selected or appointed?

Mr. MARKS. The tax commissioner is appointed by the Governor, and confirmed by the Territorial senate, and his staff is appointed by himself. They are all under civil service, however.

Representative DELANEY. Yes. How many men are on this board?

Mr. MARKS. I don't understand which board you mean.

Representative DELANEY. On the board of assessors.

Mr. MARKS. There is no board of assessors.

Representative DELANEY. All right, who is in charge of assessing property on these islands?

Mr. MARKS. The tax commissioner.

Representative DELANEY. What's his name?

Mr. MARKS. Mr. William Borthwick.

Representative DELANEY. May I ask the judge whether or not he anticipates the appearance here of Mr. William Borthwick?

Mr. ROBERTSON. We certainly do. He is on the agenda for this afternoon.

Representative DELANEY. That was just a point of information, judge. I just wanted to know. With that statement, I'm through.

Chairman ANGELL. Any further questions?

Representative TAYLOR. I'd like to get this straight in my mind, Mr. Witness. You say the Bishop estate is set up as a charitable or eleemosynary trust for the benefit of all the people in the islands?

Mr. MARKS. No; for the benefit of the Hawaiians.

Representative TAYLOR. For the benefit of the Hawaiians. And that income from that estate comes from the leasing of the lands owned by the Bishop estate, is that right?

Mr. MARKS. It is.

Representative TAYLOR. Did you ever know of an instance where any of that land was offered for private sale to the Hawaiians or other people in the islands?

Mr. MARKS. One or two.

Representative TAYLOR. Remote instances, I presume?

Mr. MARKS. Very.

Representative TAYLOR. Do you know of any land that the Bishop estate now has for sale to individuals or to private industry?

Mr. MARKS. A couple of weeks ago there was an article in the paper indicating that they were cutting up some of their urban property, and that it would soon be put upon the market. The details of it I am not acquainted with.

Representative LARCADE. Is there anyone that can supply that information, who is available? [See exhibit No. 68.]

Mr. MARKS. I believe so.

Representative LARCADE. Who, what person?

Mr. MARKS. I believe that any of the trustees can.

Representative TAYLOR. Who is one of the trustees, the most active one?

Mr. MARKS. Mr. George Collins, Mr. John Clark, ex-Governor Poindexter.

Representative LARCADE. We'll ascertain the names of the trustees.

Delegate FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the witness a few questions for purposes of developing the fact that the problems incident to the administration and tenure of lands in this Territory have engaged the attention of the public officials and private citizens over a long period of years. At the outset will you tell us with whom is vested the title to the public lands in the Territory?

Mr. MARKS. The public lands at the time of annexation were ceded to the Federal Government.

Delegate FARRINGTON. In other words, the Federal Government holds title to the public lands?

Mr. MARKS. That is correct.

Delegate FARRINGTON. The administration of the public lands is subject to laws of Congress?

Mr. MARKS. The Congress can change the land laws, and Congress alone. The only authority conferred upon the legislature in regard to the administration of public lands is the size of the land board. They can put 100 members on the land board. The land board, however, is not a policy-making board, but it is a board to which transactions involving the sale and lease and disposal of land have to be presented and approved by a two-thirds membership.

Delegate FARRINGTON. Do you know, as a matter of general information, that it is true that in the Western States, or at least most of them, the percentage of the total land held by the Federal Government is very much greater than it is in the Territory of Hawaii?

Mr. MARKS. I do not have those figures.

Delegate FARRINGTON. I think—

Chairman ANGELL. I think it's about 50 percent in my State and in some States as high as 70 percent. My chart shows 5.89 percent of the land of the Territory has definitely been placed under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government, by either a Presidential Executive order, the executive order of the Governor or act of Congress.

Delegate FARRINGTON. It's true, as you developed in your previous testimony, that in 1921 Congress enacted the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act?

Mr. MARKS. That is correct.

Delegate FARRINGTON. Setting aside some 200,000 acres for the native Hawaiian people in order to return the native people to the land of the Territory?

Mr. MARKS. That is correct.

Delegate FARRINGTON. Which was originally theirs. Now, to come up to more recent times, isn't it true that with the influx of war workers during the defense period in 1941, that the city and county of Honolulu under the authority of the legislature enacted a law for the control of rents?

Mr. MARKS. That is correct.

Delegate FARRINGTON. That was one of the first laws enacted by any city in this country?

Mr. MARKS. I am so informed.

Delegate FARRINGTON. And that the operation of that law was sufficiently satisfactory to continue throughout the war and not to be displaced by Federal control, that is correct. Now isn't it true also that the trustees of the Bishop estate are appointed by the supreme court of the Territory, which derives its appointments from the President of the United States?

Mr. MARKS. That is correct.

Delegate FARRINGTON. And periodically their accounts are subject to examinations by that court?

Mr. MARKS. Yes.

Delegate FARRINGTON. And not infrequently the policies they have pursued have been very vigorously criticized?

Mr. MARKS. And at times the trustees have been surcharged with expenditures that were not considered legitimate.

Delegate FARRINGTON. Now isn't it true also, Mr. Marks, that the public objection to the policies pursued by the Bishop estate reached the point about 2 years ago that it resulted in an extensive investigation by the legislature of the Territory, and changes in our laws regarding trustees, which cut the commissions that were paid by the trust to the trustees?

Mr. MARKS. That is correct.

Delegate FARRINGTON. I'd like also to ask you if it is not correct, in recognition of the seriousness of this land problem, that the Governor of the Territory, who is appointed by the President, appointed a committee or commission of three or four very distinguished men for the purposes of reexamining all of the laws covering the administration of our land? [See exhibit No. 37.]

Mr. MARKS. That is correct.

Delegate FARRINGTON. And that that committee finished its first year of work and was asked to continue?

Mr. MARKS. Yes.

Delegate FARRINGTON. And finally, I'd like to ask you if it isn't true that the Governor of the Territory recommended to the legislature that a public corporation be created for purposes of acquiring lands in order that they might be more readily available to private citizens?

Mr. MARKS. That recommendation was made to the last session of the legislature.

Delegate FARRINGTON. And the legislature did not act on it?

Mr. MARKS. That is correct.

Delegate FARRINGTON. Now, I wonder if you can present for the record, if you haven't incorporated it in the exhibits, the amount of land that has been acquired by the military services on the island of Oahu during the period of war? [See exhibit No. 80.]

Mr. MARKS. I can get that. I do not have it exactly available. I might say that as far as possible in dealing with land under my jurisdiction we have turned it over to them for the duration plus 6 months, feeling that a better determination could be made at that time as to the necessity of its permanent acquisition for military purposes.

Delegate FARRINGTON. Well, you can put into the record the amount of land that they have acquired, and I assume that the tax commissioner will also introduce figures showing its value, because I know, happen to know he has them. I would like also to ask that that show what portion of that land represents our most valuable land, which is our water front. I'd like to ask you, as land commissioner, if, in your opinion, the people of this Territory are competent and willing to meet the problems incident to land administration and land tenure, and if so, on the basis of their long experience out there, probably a lot more capable of dealing with that problem than is any one from the outside?

Mr. MARKS. I believe that is absolutely the case.

Delegate FARRINGTON. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman ANGELL. Mr. Marks, is it your opinion that the land ownership here differs materially from land ownership in many of the States of the continental United States?

Mr. MARKS. I don't think it does.

Chairman ANGELL. For instance, in the State of Texas, the King ranch, I had occasion to drive across it last year; it takes the better part

of a day to drive across it in an automobile. And I am familiar with a number of the States of that sort, where several hundred thousand acres are owned privately in various States of the Union. I am wondering if your land situation here differs materially from many of the States of the Union in that respect?

Mr. MARKS. I don't believe that it is. The only difference would be that our land is limited, and a 50,000-acre holding out of approximately 4,000,000 is an appreciable holding, and particularly when the Island of Hawaii, which comprises over 4,000 square miles out of the 6,000 has those two very large masses on them, which are dependent for rain water for their water supply, there being no ground water up there, and causing the settlements to be along the coast. And those things particularly accentuate the constricting influence of the larger holdings.

Chairman ANGELL. Are the Bishop estate lands subject to taxation, being held as a trust?

Mr. MARKS. I believe not. Judge Robertson will correct me.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Taxed like anybody else's property.

Chairman ANGELL. In that respect they differ from various States of the Union. Eleemosynary holdings and trusts are not subject to tax, unless the properties are devoted in competition with private property, such as income property.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Under our law the school site, strictly speaking, is exempt from taxation, but these large areas that the Bishop estate owns are taxed like anybody else's property.

Chairman ANGELL. Do they pay a tax on those mountain peaks?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Oh, yes; they pay taxes on everything they own, excepting school sites.

Representative MILLER. Perhaps this witness could answer this question. If not, I'd ask the judge to furnish it. Looking over a list of large holdings here, I see the Bishop estate, Parker ranch, Gay & Robinson, Campbell estate, Shipman, Molokai ranch, McCandless estate, John Ii estate—are any of those, other than the Bishop estate, eleemosynary trusts?

Mr. MARKS. Not that I know of.

Representative MILLER. Do you know, Judge?

Mr. ROBERTSON. That's the only eleemosynary trust recognized in that—

Representative LARCADE. Mr. Chairman, may I suggest that the witness file the charts that he has presented with the committee. [Done as exhibit 36.]

Mr. ROBERTSON. Notwithstanding the late hour, I'd like very much to ask this witness another question or two.

Chairman ANGELL. Very well, Judge.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Marks, you referred to the demand for homesites existing here and the shortage of homes. Will you state whether that applies to locations in or near the towns, otherwise urban property, or whether it refers to these mountain lands that you have referred to in your statement?

Mr. MARKS. It refers principally to the urban property.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Can you conceive of anybody wanting to acquire a homestead on the site of Mauna Kea within the area of the Parker ranch, for instance?

Mr. MARKS. Merely as a recreational site, in the same sense that people like a summer place up in the mountains.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Would that also apply to the Bishop estate holdings on the slopes of the big mountain, Mauna Loa?

Mr. MARKS. It would.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That's all.

Representative TAYLOR. Are there any Bishop holdings in the urban sections you have mentioned?

Mr. MARKS. There are. Those are under lease.

Representative TAYLOR. They are not for sale?

Mr. MARKS. Not for sale.

Representative MILLER. Do you think there would be a demand for those if they were for sale, as compared with the judge's mountain tops?

Mr. MARKS. I think there would be.

Chairman ANGELL. You stated they are preparing to put some of those on the market?

Mr. MARKS. The article I saw in the paper so stated.

Chairman ANGELL. Thank you very much, Mr. Marks. Will you call the next witness, Judge, the last witness we can hear at this morning's session?

Mr. ROBERTSON. May I say first, the subject of lands and the way the titles have come down, and the general reference, including the Bishop estate, was included in my testimony before the joint committee that was here in 1937, and appears in their report, beginning at page 387. We have not contemplated duplicating that subject at this hearing, but if this committee wants to go into that we'll be glad to produce witnesses that can give you all details concerning the Bishop estate. But I warn you that you will have to give us more time in order to cover that subject. That is apparently a rather large subject.

Chairman ANGELL. Was it fully covered in a former hearing, to which you have referred?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Well, that depends on the meaning of the word "fully." I can't say that all details connected with the Bishop estate were brought out by the questioning at the former hearing. But the Bishop estate situation was included in a general way. [See exhibit No. 16.]

Chairman ANGELL. Well, you have made reference to that, so it's available to the committee; if the committee decides it needs additional testimony, we'll call for it. You may present the next witness.

Mr. ROBERTSON. We present Mr. C. Nils Tavares, attorney general of the Territory.

Mr. TAVARES. Mr. Chairman, I am the attorney general of the Territory, having been appointed on January 1, 1945. I was born on the island of Maui, educated in the public schools of this Territory and graduated from the University of Michigan Law School in 1925. Since that time I have been either in the private practice of law or in government service, particularly my public service has been as a deputy attorney general from 1927 to 1934, and from about November of 1942 until the present time, until I was appointed attorney general. In the meantime, I have been counsel to one or the other of the houses of the Territorial legislature in practically every session, either as a member of the attorney general's office or by private employment since 1927.

The subject that I was going to take up this morning is very brief. However, I shall be glad to answer any questions to the best of my ability that the committee might wish to ask on the subject of land. I should like to point out that the people of the Territory have not been entirely unaware of their land problems and attempts have been made and are being made to remedy some of these situations.

The legislature of 1943 created a land laws revision commission of three persons, which filed a report with the Governor prior to the 1945 session of the legislature, in which they set forth the progress that had been made and asked for additional time, in view of the scope of the problem involved. I should like to present for the record a copy of their report and recommendation. [Exhibit No. 37.]

Chairman ANGELL. Without objection, it will be received.

Mr. TAVARES. That commission is still functioning, and we hope that by the next session additional constructive ideas will be ready for presentation to the Territorial legislature. In concluding this particular subject, I should like to state as my humble opinion that if the Territory becomes a State the people of this Territory will be better able and in a better position to remedy whatever conditions may be found detrimental in the way of land ownership than they can under the present Territorial government. That is my very firm opinion after a great deal of study, and I have been one of the leaders in the movement to alleviate this land shortage in this Territory. And I think that my opinions are not based on inadequate study. But for instance, if the legislature passes any law requiring the breaking up of charitable or existing estates, you run into a constitutional problem immediately. You also run into the problem of whether, under the Hawaiian Organic Act, our legislature had power to enact such a law. We take it up through our circuit and supreme courts, and it involves a construction of the organic act right up to the Supreme Court. If we were a State the appeal might stop at our supreme court. That is just one of the things I'd like to point out, which indicate that as a State the people of this Territory would be in a better position to handle that problem than they are now.

Chairman ANGELL. Are there any questions?

Representative TAYLOR. Yes; except that always where a constitutional question arises, the right exists to go from the highest court in the State to the Supreme Court of the United States. Do you agree with me on that?

Mr. TAVARES. I agree with that, but I would like to point out that since the organic act corresponds, as far as the Territory is concerned, to what our State constitution would be if we were a State, any question raised under that act must have gone right up to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals if requested, because it involves a Federal question, whereas if we were a State and a question were raised only under our State constitution there would be no appeal beyond our supreme court.

Chairman ANGELL. That is your local supreme court?

Mr. TAVARES. Yes.

Chairman ANGELL. Any further questions?

Delegate FARRINGTON. You go ahead.

Representative DELANEY. I am very much interested in the so-called fishing rights that exist here. Will you, as attorney general, explain

to this committee whether or not the fishing rights exist, and if they do, under what authority they exist?

Mr. TAVARES. Those fishing rights go back to the days of the Hawaiian kingdom, when, under the peculiar system of tenure under the King and the chiefs, actually the chief who owned an ahupuaa, or large division of land fronting on the sea, also had included in his own domain an area of the ocean adjacent in which there were special rights of fishing. No one else could fish in there except the chief and his tenants, and the chief had certain rights, such as taking his share of the catch or putting a tabu on the catch of certain types of fish during certain times. When the Territory was incorporated, as such, into the United States, those rights were preserved. There was a test case brought by the Territorial government, in which the Territory asserted that they were not vested rights and the matter went up to the United States Supreme Court, which held that those were vested rights, and that they had been preserved under the organic act. However, the organic act said they must be registered within 2 years, and then direction was made while the condemnation provision was made for condemnation of those rights. A large number of those special areas having special fishing rights were not registered, and under a decision which dragged through the courts for about 12 or more years, our Supreme Court finally held that those rights which had not been registered had been eliminated and that such elimination was constitutional. The result is that only the rights which were registered with the courts as required by the organic act, now exist, and there are quite a number of those.

Representative DELANEY. Has the Congress of the United States made any expression as to whether these rights should be abolished or maintained?

Mr. TAVARES. I think the Congress of the United States has indicated in the organic act that it is its view that they should as soon as possible be eliminated and made free to the public.

Representative DELANEY. That was stopped 45 years ago; is that right?

Mr. TAVARES. That's correct.

Representative DELANEY. Has anything been done about that?

Mr. TAVARES. Very little.

Representative DELANEY. That's all.

Mr. TAVARES. The reason for that is, that the condemnation of fishing rights was not in the early days—this is my opinion, of course—goes back largely to before my time, to be very valuable. Those fishing rights were thought to be very valuable. It would have cost a considerable amount of money to condemn them, and the legislature has not felt like putting aside the money necessary to do that. However, I think some action is, or at least one action recently, has been brought of condemnation of such rights, and the matter is now pending in the court. Unfortunately it's not as simple as it sounds. The rights of tenants, or former tenants, of these ahupuaa come up every time you file a condemnation suit. All the people who live in those lands or used to live there, claim they have rights, too, and they want their cut of the value of the fishery. I hope and expect during my administration, if I am allowed to remain, that I will make a dent in that, and try to secure condemnation of a portion, at least, of those fishing rights.

Representative DELANEY. Would you say that 45 years has been an unreasonable time in which to comply with the requests of the Congress of the United States?

Mr. TAVARES. I think it can be, I think it is unreasonable. On the other hand——

Representative DELANEY. And for the past 45 years, up to date, nothing of a substantial nature has been done, is that right?

Mr. TAVARES. Except to test the validity of the law which required——

Representative DELANEY. I said of a substantial nature.

Mr. TAVARES. Yes; I should like to point this out, however, in mitigation, that most of those fishing rights today are worth very little. It's practically impossible to prevent poaching and prevent the public from using the beaches, and I think most of the owners of those private rights today, except in a very few instances, to many of them they are practically valueless.

Representative DELANEY. If I were to take a boat and go out on these private rights would there be anyone to object to my fishing there?

Mr. TAVARES. Some of the owners might object in a very few places. In most cases——

Representatives DELANEY. Well, wait, in what manner might they object?

Mr. TAVARES. The owner of the private fishing right, or what used to correspond to the chief or konohiki who owned that fishing right, whoever owns that today would have to file a complaint in the court for trespass or file an injunction suit or some other appropriate action.

Representative DELANEY. And would you pursue—would you defend that man who happened to fish in that territory?

Mr. TAVARES. My duties are to execute the laws of this Territory. If the laws of this Territory provide a penalty for infringement of a private right it certainly would not be my duty to protect that person who infringed it. I do not think that because the Territory has been remiss in condemning these rights that two wrongs would make a right, and that we should then defend persons who infringed them.

Representative DELANEY. I understand that, as attorney general, you took office January 1, 1945. Of course, I don't want to press my question as to your administration. What can you, if anything, promise the people of Hawaii as to their rights to fish in any of these lands that are now held by a select few?

Mr. TAVARES. What can I, as attorney general, promise?

Representative DELANEY. Yes.

Mr. TAVARES. I make no promises. I intend to do my duty as I see it. I shall attempt to do that, as occasion permits. During the war we have been unable to do any of our other matters, of the ordinary matters, of civil administration. Now that the war is over, we intend to take those up and carry them out to the best of our ability.

Representative DELANEY. Do you feel that people in the near future will be relieved?

Mr. TAVARES. I feel they will.

Representative DELANEY. All right.

Chairman ANGELL. Mr. Miller.

Representative MILLER. Well, I was just wondering how extensive, or how much the owners of these rights, how vigilant they are in enforcing them?

Mr. TAVARES. There are a few who are vigilant. My experience and observation have been that the large majority of them do a lot of complaining, but actually take very little action.

Representative MILLER. Does it complicate the enforcement of your conservation laws, fish and game laws?

Mr. TAVARES. Not at all. They, the owners of these fishing rights, have to obey our fishing laws just as well as anyone else.

Delegate FARRINGTON. I'd like to ask the witness to outline in a very brief statement the purpose of the legislation presented to the last session of the legislature by the Governor creating a corporation for the acquisition of land.

Mr. TAVARES. That was at the last session. The Governor, with the assistance of my office, and I am proud to admit that I had a large part in that project—submitted to the legislature a proposed bill creating a home development authority, giving it corporate existence and authorizing it to acquire by purchase or condemnation, or both, sites suitable for homes in the vicinity of the city of Honolulu. That authority would have been authorized after acquiring these lands, to subdivide them, in accordance with plans approved by the city planning commission, and in accordance with the master plan which we have for the city and county, and after properly providing for parks, playgrounds, roads, utilities, sell the lots for homes at appraised values which were to be sufficient to cover the cost of the projects. That bill was very new, not only to the jurisprudence of this Territory, but I think of the whole United States. I believe only one State in the Union—I think that was North or South Dakota—has ever tried that, and it was a failure. That was such a new idea that even in the house of representatives the matter took so much time for discussion, in order to explore the possibilities, that it died in committee, and was not passed. I was one of the persons who strenuously attempted to get that bill through the legislature. It is my belief that that bill has a better than 50-50 chance of getting through the next legislature, but like all new ideas, apparently, it is difficult to sell them in one session. We have found that out in all important legislation. Even the uniform sales law was defeated in one session because people didn't understand it.

Representative LARCADE. In whose ownership, in whose title are vested these lands that are proposed to be developed under that bill referred to?

Mr. TAVARES. The bill provided for condemnation or purchase of any land from anyone in the proper location. Unfortunately, one of the things which mitigated against the bill was the possibility that if this committee, or commission, went into an area, the large area, to condemn it and subdivide it for homes, they might have to take some small holdings. And that is one of the things that helped defeat the bill. I do not believe that it is feasible for any authority like that to be stopped by a few small holdings in between. If they are going to develop a subdivision, they have got to have it all, and break it up into proper segments. But that is one of the problems which you have to sell to the people, that, along with taking the big holdings, sometimes you have to take a few small ones to round up the project and make it well balanced and well planned as a subdivision.

Chairman ANGELL. Any further questions?

Mr. ROBERTSON. May I ask a question, Mr. Chairman?

Chairman ANGELL. Certainly.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Tavares, when the organic act was passed and the Supreme Court of the United States recognized the rights of these fisheries as private property, Congress said the Territory should compensate the owners, did it not?

Mr. TAVARES. That is correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON. So that what was needed was an appropriation by the legislature to pay the compensation?

Mr. TAVARES. That has been the view, I believe, of most attorneys general, that before the legislature made an appropriation they had no authority to proceed. My office is going to operate at the present time on the theory that the act of Congress did authorize us to proceed without a legislative appropriation, and that we can depend upon the legislature within the 2 years allowed by law after a judgment is secured to appropriate the funds necessary to pay for any fisheries which we may complete condemnation on.

Mr. ROBERTSON. So far as you know has any Governor of this Territory requested the legislature to make an appropriation to acquire these fisheries?

Mr. TAVARES. My recollection is that that has been done, at least once. I am not certain of this, but I think during Governor Judd's administration there was a request made to appropriate the funds, and that the legislature did not do so.

Mr. ROBERTSON. In the meantime, you are aware, are you not, that the Federal Government has condemned and taken some of the principal fisheries on this island, namely at Pearl Harbor?

Mr. TAVARES. That is correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That's all.

Chairman ANGELL. Those fishery rights are not dissimilar to the so-called aboriginal rights in the Territory of Alaska, are they not?

Mr. TAVARES. I'm sorry, sir; I am not acquainted with the Alaskan situation.

Chairman ANGELL. It has been held that the aborigines have certain fishing rights adjacent to the land they held at the time Alaska was taken over from Russia by the United States.

Representative MILLER. Certain Indians have acquired certain rights. For instance in California, and universally throughout the West, as to fishing, the right to take fish, even out of season, but that right cannot be passed on to someone else, or does not follow the land; it is peculiar to them, and our own experience in California has been that where they have used that subterfuge to violate the law, that the Federal court stepped in and stopped them. We can take them into Federal court. We had one case clearly where, during a closed season, the Indians would go out and fish, and we stopped them on that. They could take fish for tribal use, and it was peculiar to them and could not be passed on to someone else.

Chairman ANGELL. It's true on the Columbia River, but I think those rights go down through tribal relations. If there is nothing further, the committee will stand adjourned until 2 o'clock.

(The hearing recessed at 12:25 o'clock p. m., to reconvene at 2 o'clock p. m.)

AFTER RECESS

Chairman LARCADE. The meeting will come to order. At this time the chairman calls back to the stand Mr. C. Nils Tavares, attorney general of the Territory of Hawaii.

Mr. TAVARES. I understand that your statement was not completed when the committee adjourned for lunch, and that you wish to proceed further?

Mr. TAVARES. Yes, Mr. Chairman. I want to correct one statement, namely, I said that I was appointed on the 1st of January 1945. That was in error. It was 1944.

The other thing I would like to say is that having been born and raised in this Territory, and having lived in communities from time to time where all of the various racial groups were gathered in rather large numbers, I am convinced that in every way the citizens of this Territory are prepared for statehood, and that I believe in it with all my heart and soul.

Chairman LARCADE. Thank you very much, Mr. Tavares.

(At this time Mr. Tavares was excused and withdrew.)

Chairman LARCADE. At this time the chairman will yield the chair to the gentleman from California, Mr. Miller.

(Representative George P. Miller of California took the chair.)

Chairman MILLER. Gentlemen of the committee, Mr. Charles E. Morris of the American Legion is here, and wants to present an invitation to us to attend their meeting. I do not think we will find it possible to do so, but I would like to have Mr. Morris present his invitation personally.

Will you please state your name.

Mr. CHARLES E. MORRIS. I am Charles E. Morris, resident of Molokai, former department commander of the American Legion of Hawaii.

Mr. Chairman and gentleman of the committee, tonight will be the regularly scheduled executive meeting of the American Legion, Department of Hawaii. I have been asked to extend an invitation to this committee to attend that meeting, which I can assure you will be very important, and I believe, in a degree, educational in matters of civic importance, and if it does not conflict with the routine of the committee, we would be very happy to have you with us.

Chairman MILLER. Unfortunately our time between now and midnight is pretty well taken up with a reception by the Governor, and we have been asked to go to Hickam Field. If it is at all possible, we will attend.

Mr. MORRIS. As is consistent with the usual department meetings here, the meeting may adjourn a little before 12, but as is customary, they will probably continue in the back room until the small hours.

Chairman MILLER. If we find it possible, we shall be glad to attend. Your next witness, Judge, please.

Mr. ROBERTSON. We now present Dr. Gilbert G. Lentz, director of the Legislative Reference Bureau of the Territory of Hawaii.

Mr. GILBERT G. LENTZ. Mr. Chairman, my name is Gilbert G. Lentz. I am director of the Legislative Reference Bureau for the Territory of Hawaii. The legislative reference bureau is a reference and research agency for the members of the Territorial legislature.

Chairman MILLER. Mr. Lentz, will you please give us your background, or at least, some of your background for the committee, in line with its previous rulings, so that we may know your qualifications.

Mr. LENTZ. Yes, Mr. Chairman. As I said, the Legislative Reference Bureau is a research reference agency for Territorial departments, and members of the legislative body, and Territorial officials. Prior to coming to the Territory in 1943, I was assistant director of the Illinois Legislative Council for the State of Illinois, and following that, assistant professor of political science of Occidental College in Los Angeles.

Mr. Chairman, I have a brief statement which I would like to present, containing a summary of the Territorial system of government, the relationships of the Territorial and the local government, with several exhibits, giving further detail, which I would like to offer as exhibits at appropriate points. This statement, Mr. Chairman, will take only about 5 minutes to read.

Chairman MILLER. All right, proceed to read it.

Mr. LENTZ. My name is Gilbert G. Lentz. I am director of the Legislative Reference Bureau for the Territory of Hawaii. The legislative reference bureau is a reference and research agency for the members of the Territorial legislature and the Territorial departments. It is a department of the University of Hawaii, of which I am also professor of public administration. Prior to coming to Hawaii in 1943, I was assistant director of the Illinois Legislative Council for the State of Illinois, and later assistant professor of government at Occidental College in Los Angeles.

The statements which I shall make before your committee are designed primarily to sketch briefly the general nature of the Territorial system of government, a comparison of this system with states, and the division of governmental functions between the Territorial and local governments. I ask to file with your committee for more complete information on this subject, exhibits as follows:

1. Organizational chart for the government of the Territory of Hawaii. [Exhibit No. 38.]
2. Statement of organization and functions of the departments, boards, and commissions of the territorial government. [Exhibit No. 39.]
3. Organization chart for the city and county of Honolulu. [Exhibit No. 40.]
4. Statement of the organization and functions of departments and agencies of the government of the city and county of Honolulu. [Exhibit No. 41.]
5. Statement of division of functions of government between the city and county of Honolulu and the Territorial government. [Exhibit No. 42.]

From the standpoint of organization the Territorial government of Hawaii is a government that conforms to the standards of many of the State governments of progressive States. The Territory of Hawaii, in spite of insular separation from the States, has maintained through the exchange of personnel and by observation on the part of Territorial officials, a constant touch with procedures and developments of State government. Although the Territory operates under an organic act which may be changed only by an act of Congress, the powers of government left by this organic act to the Territorial legislature have permitted the development of a fairly well integrated and administratively sound government. Agencies of the government and functions of government created by the organic act or con-

tinued by the organic act from the republic or monarchy have undergone little change since the enactment of the organic act in 1900. However, fields of government left to legislative enactment by the Territory have undergone a number of changes which are, I believe, in line with the progress of the States of the Union. For instance, Hawaii has a modern budget system, a thorough and comprehensive merit system for governmental employees, a liberal retirement system, and well organized and professionally staffed Territorial departments for major governmental functions, such as agriculture, public works, welfare, health, institutions, education, labor, and so forth.

The record of the Territory of Hawaii in enactment of uniform and model laws recommended by such agencies as the council of state governments, uniform laws commissioners, and individual national agencies, has been a record which is equal to that of the typical State.

The primary differences between the government of the Territory of Hawaii and that of States of the Union have been brought out in these hearings a number of times, and require no further elaboration here. Some may be enumerated, however, in the following summary statements: Whereas the average State has from 5 to 15 State-wide elected officials, Hawaii has 1. This is the office of the Delegate to the House of Representatives. Territorial offices appointed by sources outside of the Territory and subject to appointment by the President of the United States with consent of the Senate of the United States, are the Governor, secretary of the Territory, and judges of the supreme and circuit courts. Laws of the Territorial legislature, according to the organic act, may be disallowed by the Congress of the United States. The fact that no law of the Territorial legislature has been disallowed is a credit both to the Territorial legislature and to the Congress.

The relationships between the office of Governor and the Territorial legislature are substantially the same as those of the States. The Governor reports to the Territorial legislature biennially with power to make recommendations, and submits the Territorial budget, as an executive budget, to the legislature. The Governor has the veto power over Territorial legislation and the power to veto individual items in appropriation bills. His appointments, except in the case of the director of the bureau of budget, are subject to confirmation by the Territorial senate.

In the field of local government the organic act specifies that the legislature may create and provide for the government of counties or municipalities. There is no municipal government, as such, in the Territory of Hawaii. This is because the largest and only substantial metropolitan area in the Territory, the city of Honolulu, is governed under provisions for city and county consolidation. Apart from the county seats on each of the islands, there are no other concentrations in population requiring separate urban government. The position of the Territory of Hawaii in this respect is different from the system of local government in most of the States. However, this arises out of the geographical separation of the four counties and the rural nature of much of the area outside of the metropolitan part of the island of Oahu.

The four counties of the Territory of Hawaii are governed both by general and by special acts. In the case of the city and county of

Honolulu, a comprehensive charter enacted in 1907 provides for the structure and powers of the government of Honolulu. In the city and county of Honolulu, governed by a board of supervisors of seven members, there are five elected governmental officials in addition to the members of the board of supervisors. These are the mayor, treasurer, auditor, clerk, and sheriff.

The division of governmental functions between the Territorial government and the city and county of Honolulu follows much the same pattern as that in many of the States with large metropolitan areas. In the Territory of Hawaii, law enforcement is primarily the responsibility of the local government, except for county police commissioners appointed by the Governor of the Territory. In the field of education, the Territory differs from the position of most of the States in that the entire school system is consolidated under a department of the Territorial government. This has served to unify educational standards and has eliminated the problem of school-district consolidation and the problems of financial support for small rural school districts. School buildings and maintenance are the responsibility of the local government. Public safety through police protection, traffic control, and so forth, is primarily the responsibility of the local governments. Enforcement of Territorial regulatory standards is primarily the responsibility of the Territory through the departments concerned. The city-county and the Territory share responsibility for such functions as health, recreation, corrections, and so forth.

Chairman MILLER. Are there any questions, Mr. Angell?

Representative ANGELL. No.

Chairman MILLER. Mr. Delaney?

Representative DELANEY. No.

Chairman MILLER. Thank you very much, Mr. Lentz.

(At this time Mr. Lentz was excused and withdrew.)

Mr. ROBERTSON. I will next present Mr. Gerald R. Corbett, secretary of the Territory of Hawaii.

Chairman MILLER. We have a rather heavy schedule before us, and it is necessary that we get out early. We would thank you if you can help us in that respect.

Mr. GERALD R. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, my name is Gerald R. Corbett. I am secretary of the Territory of Hawaii. I was born in the State of Wisconsin in 1903. I was educated in the public and private schools of the States of Washington and California. I attended the University of California at Los Angeles. I was graduated in 1926 from Loyola University with an LL. B. degree. I am an attorney, licensed to practice in all the courts of the Territory. I am a member of the State Bar of California. I have resided in the Territory of Hawaii for 18 years past, during which time I engaged in general practice of law 5 years. I was deputy city and county attorney for 6 years, and for the 5 succeeding years was controller and chief financial officer of the city and county of Honolulu. I took office in my present position July 5, 1944.

Chairman MILLER. Thank you.

Mr. CORBETT. I have prepared a statement which will take about 5 minutes to read, Mr. Chairman. I would be glad to read it.

Chairman MILLER. You can go ahead, Mr. Corbett.

Mr. CORBETT. The organic act provides that a Delegate to the House of Representatives of the United States shall be elected by the voters of Hawaii to serve during each Congress. The act specifies that the election for Delegate shall be held on the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November of each even numbered year. The Territorial laws specify the same date for the Territorial and county general elections, at which members of the legislature and officers of the city and county and counties are elected.

All candidates for elective offices are required to be nominated at open primary elections at which the voters participate without being required to make known their party allegiance. Primary elections are held on the first Saturday in October.

Nomination papers, signed by the candidate and by specified numbers of duly qualified electors are required to be filed before the name of any candidate can be printed on any official primary ballot. Such papers are required to show the party—or nonpartisan—designation of the candidate and to contain a certificate by the candidate that he is a qualified elector of the district in which he is a candidate.

For many years past, almost all candidates for public office have sought nomination as members of the National Democratic and National Republican Parties. The last election at which a candidate for Delegate to Congress was nominated as a member of any other party, or on a nonpartisan basis, was the special election of 1922. [See exhibit 13-E.] Except for one member of the senate in 1937 and 1939, the members of the Territorial legislature have all been members of the two dominant national parties at every session since 1913. [See exhibit 13-F.]

The clerks of each county and the city and county are responsible for the registration of voters and the formulation of lists of qualified electors within their respective jurisdictions.

The registration lists are kept on a live and accurate basis by requirements that the county clerks strike from the registers the names of any electors who fail to vote in a general election. They are also required to correct their lists on the basis of periodic reports from the courts and the bureau of vital statistics.

The clerks also prepare the ballots and tabulate the votes for county officers. The secretary of Hawaii is responsible for the conduct of the Territorial primary and general elections and tabulates the votes and certifies the results thereof.

Polling places, designated by the Governor, are in charge of inspectors of election, appointed by him from the opposing parties. All expenses of elections, except the cost of printing and tabulating county ballots, are borne by the Territory. The sum appropriated to meet the cost of the 1946 elections is \$48,000.

The consolidation on a contemporaneous basis of the local and Territorial primary and general elections results in substantial savings in the costs of elections. There has been no indication, in recent years, at least, of any confusion on the part of the electorate due to the presentation at one time of both Territorial and county candidates and issues.

The six representative districts of the Territory, which include the four senatorial districts, are divided into 158 precincts, which, on the

basis of 1944 registration, ranged in numbers of voters registered from 23 to 1,334. A total of 84,325 voters were registered in 1944, of whom 51,006 or more than 60 percent were registered in the fourth and fifth districts, comprising the city and county of Honolulu. Of the total registered electors, 71,704, or more than 85 percent, cast their votes.

In order to qualify as a voter under the organic act and Territorial laws, a person must be a United States citizen, not less than 21 years of age, who has resided in the Territory for 1 year, and in his representative district for 3 months, and who is able to speak, read, and write the English or Hawaiian language. The lack of accurate statistics as to the number of Hawaii's people possessing these qualifications makes it difficult to appraise the extent to which those people exercise their franchise privileges. However, it is clear that increasing interest and participation has attended each succeeding campaign and election, and a comparison with State statistics showing the ratio of votes cast for single offices receiving the highest vote in 1942, to the number of citizens of voting age, according to the 1940 census, shows that the percentage for Hawaii, based on adult citizen estimates, was higher than that in 13 different States. [See exhibit 13-G.] Also, although the ratio of voters to the total population is still considerably less than the mainland average, it has steadily increased during the years and a comparison of the percentages of the population registered and voting in the city and county of Honolulu in 1940, with figures available for 15 large mainland cities, indicates a higher percentage rate for Honolulu than for 6 of such cities. The same tabulation [see exhibit 13-H] indicates that the percentage of registrants voting in Honolulu greatly exceeded the percentage shown for any of the same cities.

While the total population in 1940 was somewhat less than three times that of 1900, the number of registered voters had increased almost eightfold during the same period, from 11,216 in 1900 to 87,312 in 1940.

It is highly probable that the extension to our electorate of the privilege of voting for the President, and for Senators and Representatives who could express by their votes Hawaii's interest in and convictions upon matters of national policy, would stimulate and broaden our citizen participation in elections.

I might state, in addition to the statement originally, and which I submitted to the committee, there have been submitted exhibits Nos. 13-A, to 13-I, inclusive, all but two of which were prepared by me.

Chairman MILLER. Without objection they will be filed and made a part of the record.

Mr. CORBETT. I might note at this time that exhibit 13-I, which comprises the official result of the plebiscite vote in 1940, is an official document of my office.

I might add just very briefly, in addition to the duty of conducting elections and the normal duties performed by me, which are comparable to those performed by a secretary of state, that my office, or I, rather, have the duty of acting as Governor, in the absence or illness of the Governor. In addition to that, I am chairman of the board of commissioners of the public archives, having charge of all archival material. And also—a somewhat unique feature—I am in charge of the issuance of delayed certificates of birth.

I should be very happy to answer any questions on the subject of elections, as well as on any of the other subjects I have touched upon.

Representative DELANEY. Is there any law that guarantees to the individual citizens the right to vote? By that I mean allows them time off from their work in order to vote?

Mr. CORBETT. I do not recall whether there is a time-off requirement in our law. However, general election day is a legal holiday.

Representative DELANEY. The workers are not in the fields?

Mr. CORBETT. Generally it is a legal holiday by statute.

Representative DELANEY. When you spoke about registration, I assume that you have permanent registration, is that right?

Mr. CORBETT. The registration is permanent, so long as the voter exercises his right of franchise. If he fails to vote in the general election his name is stricken from the list. He can reregister.

Representative DELANEY. Will you explain to us how the voter can reregister?

Mr. CORBETT. He merely presents himself to the clerk of the county in which he resides, and in practice, he merely refers back to his former registration, and as a matter of course is again placed on the list.

Representative DELANEY. Can that be done on election day, or prior to the election day?

Mr. CORBETT. The registration lists close, I believe, about 10 days prior to election day.

Representative DELANEY. If a man failed to vote in the general election, would he have an opportunity to vote in the primary?

Mr. CORBETT. In the next primary?

Representative DELANEY. Yes.

Mr. CORBETT. No; he would have to reregister prior to the primary.

Representative DELANEY. And make a declaration as to which party he intends to vote?

Mr. CORBETT. Oh, no; not at the time of registration. A voter in Hawaii at no time has to make a declaration of party allegiance. Our primaries are not conducted that way. They are open. The voter does not have to declare himself either at the time of registration or at the time that he votes.

Chairman MILLER. I have been told, and this is true, is it not, that all the names appear on the ballot? For instance, you elect your members to the house of representatives by districts, six to a district, is that correct? Or four to a district?

Mr. CORBETT. There are six different districts and the number of representatives vary in each.

Chairman MILLER. All right, but assume that you have 4 to a district, you might have 12 people running for the Democratic nomination.

Mr. CORBETT. That's right.

Chairman MILLER. And 16 people running for the Republican nomination.

Mr. CORBETT. That's right.

Chairman MILLER. And three or four people on minor parties, if you have them, and they are all on the one ballot.

Mr. CORBETT. That is correct.

Chairman MILLER. You vote for, we will assume, four in that particular district?

Mr. CORBETT. That is correct.

Chairman MILLER. I can go in and select in the primary two Democrats, one Republican, and one off-party person?

Mr. CORBETT. That is correct.

Chairman MILLER. As long as I do not vote for more than the total number of people to be selected, I can scratch from one ballot to the other?

Mr. CORBETT. You are warned right on the face of the ballot to vote for four only.

Chairman MILLER. Any other questions?

Representative TAYLOR. Is it true at the present time that the greater number of representatives in your house of representatives represent a minority of the people here?

Mr. CORBETT. That depends on what you mean. I am sure that the representatives themselves have the feeling that they represent all the people. Perhaps you are thinking of some lack of balance between the city and county of Honolulu and the other islands.

Representative TAYLOR. That is it, exactly.

Mr. CORBETT. Well, at the present time, on the basis of population, this island has about between 60 and 70 percent of the population, and with that, 40 percent of representation. We have slightly over 60 percent of the registered voters throughout the Territory, with the same 40 percent representation in both house and the senate.

Representative TAYLOR. Do you think reapportionment advisable at this time?

Mr. CORBETT. It would seem that reapportionment would be indicated, and would have been indicated for some time past. There is quite a history connected with that. The organic act provides that the reapportionment shall be made on the basis of the first session after the census enumeration on the basis of the population in each district of the Territory who are citizens of the Territory.

Now, actually there never has been a census enumeration which has specifically given us the information as to the number of citizens of the Territory of Hawaii residing in each district. And just as a matter of opinion, I think that it is only human to expect that the people who are in office, some of the people who are in office from larger districts, under those circumstances would be somewhat reluctant to vote to reapportion, and thereby, perhaps, eliminate themselves.

Chairman MILLER. I can easily see that.

Delegate FARRINGTON. Didn't the last census provide the information that was necessary to carry out the provisions of the organic act?

Mr. CORBETT. So far as I have been able to ascertain from printed publications of the census bureau, it did not.

There are several different approaches that could be made to the problem. For example, the committee report in 1937, I believe, suggested two different approaches, one of which was to reapportion and redistrict on the basis of the latest vote for Delegate, and another of which was to reapportion and redistrict the house of representatives alone, and to allow the Senate to remain on its present status.

Delegate FARRINGTON. I believe that once the legislature reached an agreement on a basis for reappointment, and the legislature petitioned Congress for an amendment to the organic act, which would enable the legislature to carry out the intent of the agreement that was reached.

Mr. CORBETT. I don't recall that.

Delegate FARRINGTON. Do you recall the year in which that was done?

Mr. CORBETT. I do not recall the year in which that was reached, Mr. Farrington.

Delegate FARRINGTON. I am quite confident that an agreement was reached, because I happened to be in the legislature at the time.

I might say for the benefit of the members of the committee, that this has been a highly controversial issue in the Territory for some time, that at least two congressional committees have recommended that the provision of the organic act calling for reapportionment of the legislature be carried out. All students of our election laws and the construction of our legislature are agreed that it should be carried out, but the legislature has failed to reach any agreement because of the resistance that has come from the outside islands. Now, do you believe that is a healthy situation?

Mr. CORBETT. My personal belief is that it is not a healthy situation.

Delegate FARRINGTON. But you believe in time the legislature will correct that situation?

Mr. CORBETT. I am unable to say. Frankly, I do not recall that the legislature has ever taken any action, other than to petition Congress to act, whereas the organic act authorizes the legislature itself to act. I do not recall any session in which they took any action which could reasonably be considered as approaching real action on their own part.

Delegate FARRINGTON. But certainly, in drafting the State constitution, special care and study should be given to the subject of reapportionment?

Mr. CORBETT. By all means.

Delegate FARRINGTON. So that the people of the Island of Oahu who constitute the majority, should have the majority in at least one house?

Mr. CORBETT. That is correct. Of course, the opportunity and privilege of voting on a constitution is about the only way that I can think of that this matter can be passed upon directly by the people—by all the people of the Territory.

Representative ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, I might say that the conditions existing here are not peculiar to Hawaiian Islands. In my district in Oregon we have between 30 and 40 percent of the population that only have about 20 percent of representation in the legislature, and we are never able to change it, by reason of the fact that we are out-voted in the rest of the State.

Mr. CORBETT. Well, that situation exists here. I do not mean to imply that the situation existed only as between the islands. There is a reasonably serious disproportion as between the fourth and fifth districts on this island, the Island of Oahu. There is an even more serious disproportion between the first and second district on the big island which you are to visit later in the week.

Chairman MILLER. Does the organic act provide for a referendum?

Mr. CORBETT. No. It does not.

Chairman MILLER. Are there any other questions?

Mr. ROBERTSON. May I ask a question?

Chairman MILLER. Yes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Will you state whether this Territory has a secret ballot system?

Mr. CORBETT. It does.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Can you state whether the elections here are clean?

Mr. CORBETT. I have only had the privilege of conducting one election, but on the basis of my experience as a voter, and my general observation over the course of 18 years, I think they are as clean as any elections that are held anywhere in the United States.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Can you state when the secret ballot was adopted here?

Mr. CORBETT. I cannot give you the year, but I believe it was very, very early.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Perhaps I might be permitted to state that the secret ballot system was adopted here during the period of the monarchy, as long ago as 1888, quite a number of years before it became generally used in the United States.

Mr. CORBETT. Along that line of the conduct of elections, I might briefly remark that the law forbids the solicitation of votes either for a candidate or on any particular issue, within 50 feet of any polling place. Our laws also require the closing of liquor establishments on any election day, and there are other safeguards of that nature.

Representative TAYLOR. Does the voter vote in the booth?

Mr. CORBETT. The voter votes in the booth, entirely in secret.

Representative TAYLOR. How are the voting places designated?

Mr. CORBETT. The voting places are designated by the Governor, that is, the polling places themselves. In practice here in Honolulu we have a number of booths which are kept permanently for the purpose. They are really little houses, and are moved to specific locations. They are designed solely for the purpose of voting. They are separated into voting compartments, with rails, and so forth, which are all in there permanently, with places for the boxes.

Representative TAYLOR. The ballots are marked, and then dropped into the ballot box that is sealed?

Mr. CORBETT. That is correct.

Representative TAYLOR. You have no machines?

Mr. CORBETT. We have no voting machines; no.

Chairman MILLER. Any other questions? Thank you very much, Mr. Corbett.

(Mr. Corbett at this time was excused and withdrew.)

Mr. ROBERTSON. We present Mr. William Borthwick, tax commissioner of the Territory, who may be accompanied by Mr. Campbell C. Crozier, his chief deputy.

Chairman MILLER. Mr. Borthwick.

Mr. WILLIAM BORTHWICK. I am William Borthwick, tax commissioner of the Territory of Hawaii since 1934. I had formerly been a member of the legislature, and have been engaged in business for approximately 30 years.

I have no written statement to read. I was appointed tax commissioner in the year 1934 when things were pretty chaotic. There were, at the time, 18,000 delinquent taxpayers for some \$6,000,000 on the books. In other words, we had gone through a rather severe time.

Just immediately before that, and in the intervening years, the tax system of Hawaii had been almost completely revamped and made anew. Before 1932 we worked on an enterprise for profit. Business entities were capitalized on the basis of profits that were made, and that was the way the values were determined. There was little in the way of ad valorem valuation.

Representative ANGELL. May I ask the witness to put the microphone in front of him, please.

Mr. BORTHWICK. Since that time there have been new laws enacted at almost every session of the legislature. We now have a tax on real property, which is a city and county realization. We have a tax on personal property, the proceeds of which also go to the cities and counties. We have a net income tax. We have a public utility tax. We have a liquid fuel tax. We have a tax that was passed by the legislature in 1943 on compensation and dividends. We have a bank excise tax. We have a liquor tax. We have a tobacco tax. We have what is commonly called here a gross income tax, which is a privilege tax for the privilege of doing business. We also have what is known as a consumption tax, to back up the gross income tax, and we have an unemployment compensation tax, which is coordinated with the Federal measure, but which is collected through the office of the tax commissioner.

Chairman MILLER. Have you any further statement?

Mr. BORTHWICK. No further statement.

Chairman MILLER. Any questions?

Representative DELANEY. Mr. Borthwick, I believe you are somewhat familiar with the Governor's message to the legislature in which he recommended that more land be made available for home sites?

Mr. BORTHWICK. Yes.

Representative DELANEY. Did you, as a public official, come out in favor of that request?

Mr. BORTHWICK. You mean did I come out and advocate it?

Representative DELANEY. That's right.

Mr. BORTHWICK. I did not.

Representative DELANEY. You, of course, were familiar, most familiar with this shortage of home sites here in the Territory?

Mr. BORTHWICK. Yes.

Representative DELANEY. And in spite of the fact that you were tax commissioner, you failed to advocate that progressive piece of legislation? Is that right?

Mr. BORTHWICK. No. That isn't right. I spoke to my friends. I heartily concurred in what the Governor said. I have been doing that for a number of years, Mr. Delaney, but I didn't put anything in the newspapers about it, or anything of that kind. I think the people, generally, know my sentiments.

Representative DELANEY. Well, didn't you feel, due to your position as tax commissioner that it would exert some influence on the legislature?

Mr. BORTHWICK. Really I don't.

Representative DELANEY. You do not feel that it would?

Mr. BORTHWICK. No.

Representative DELANEY. In other words, their minds are made up? Would you say that?

Mr. BORTHWICK. Well, you can say that all right.

Representative DELANEY. What do you mean, "you can say that all right?" I can say it all right, but would you say it?

Mr. BORTHWICK. No. I wouldn't say that their minds are made up.

Representative DELANEY. Well, I understand that this proposal or bill that was offered never came out of committee. Is that right?

Mr. BORTHWICK. So far as I know that is correct.

Representative DELANEY. And the public never had an opportunity to testify as to what their feelings were on this important matter?

Mr. BORTHWICK. I know of no testimony that they gave.

Representative DELANEY. Would you say that there is a critical shortage of building lots in the Territory?

Mr. BORTHWICK. Yes. There is probably not a critical shortage so much, any more than there is a critical shortage in building material.

Representative DELANEY. That is generally throughout the entire world today, isn't that true?

Mr. BORTHWICK. Yes. I think that is true.

Representative DELANEY. But it is not generally the fact that there is no land available? Would you agree with me on that statement?

Mr. BORTHWICK. To a great extent I will, Mr. Delaney.

Representative DELANEY. And in this particular Territory land is very short for building sites?

Mr. BORTHWICK. Land available to sites, yes, it is.

Representative DELANEY. What moves, do you know of, were made by the legislature, or other public officials, to alleviate that condition?

Mr. BORTHWICK. Well, I don't recall any particular move.

Representative DELANEY. You, of course, are interested in the welfare of a great majority of the citizens of this community?

Mr. BORTHWICK. Yes.

Representative DELANEY. And you realize that there is a critical housing shortage?

Mr. BORTHWICK. Yes.

Representative DELANEY. You, realize that if building lots were available, in all probability in the near future you would be able to overcome that housing shortage.

Mr. BORTHWICK. You mean so far as land is concerned?

Representative DELANEY. Yes. That's right.

Mr. BORTHWICK. Well, it can be overcome.

Representative DELANEY. Well, is there anything being done to make building sites available to those who desire them at a reasonable price?

Mr. BORTHWICK. Publicly?

Representative DELANEY. Yes.

Mr. BORTHWICK. By public authority?

Representative DELANEY. Yes.

Mr. BORTHWICK. I don't keep track of those things. There has been a great deal of agitation, but I have been pretty well filled up, or my time has, with taking brickbats as tax commissioner. I stuck my neck out as little as possible.

Representative DELANEY. I appreciate that. I notice in the daily paper certain land advertised for sale. I will ask if you had noticed such advertisements in the paper?

Mr. BORTHWICK. Yes, at outrageous prices.

Representative DELANEY. What have you done to correct that situation, if anything?

Mr. BORTHWICK. There is little that the tax commissioner can do, Mr. Delaney.

Representative DELANEY. Who has the right to assess the valuation of property?

Mr. BORTHWICK. The tax commissioner; the tax office.

Representative DELANEY. Who does that come under?

Mr. BORTHWICK. That comes under me.

Representative DELANEY. Who is the man who directly assesses the value of the property?

Mr. BORTHWICK. Mr. Crozier and Mr. Fuller.

Representative DELANEY. And under your direction? I withdraw that. Did you direct Mr. Crozier or Mr. Fuller to make an appraisal or reappraisal of all of the unimproved property?

Mr. BORTHWICK. We do that every 4 years, Mr. Delaney.

Representative DELANEY. When did you do it for the last time?

Mr. BORTHWICK. We started on that, Mr. Delaney, in July 1945, for the year 1946.

Representative DELANEY. How much of the property has been revalued since that time?

Mr. BORTHWICK. Practically all of it.

Representative DELANEY. All of the property?

Mr. BORTHWICK. Practically.

Representative DELANEY. Now, would you say from your knowledge as tax commissioner that a man could buy property at an amount close to the assessed valuation?

Mr. BORTHWICK. He couldn't—could not.

Representative DELANEY. That's all.

Chairman MILLER. Mr. Angell?

Representative ANGELL. Are you familiar with tax values generally throughout the United States, in continental United States?

Mr. BORTHWICK. I am a member of the National Tax Association, having met with those gentlemen until the war. I contacted some of them this last fall while I was back on the mainland.

Representative ANGELL. Is it a fact or not a fact that in most of the States of the United States assessed values are far below the sale value?

Mr. BORTHWICK. Almost to the same proportion that it is here. Not quite, however, because we are hemmed in by water, but I found tremendous values, and the asking price was entirely beyond all reason in many cities of the United States.

Representative ANGELL. I know in my own community properties frequently sell at from 8 to 10 times as much as they are assessed, and there is supposed to be tax equalization throughout the entire State, so that the difference in the rate of tax will adjust that failure to tax at full value.

Mr. BORTHWICK. Yes; that is what we attempt to do. Everybody has the right to appeal from the valuation that we place. Of course, if it is raised to any extent they do appeal. More frequently some of the large estates. They appeal sometimes when, it seems to me, that they should not appeal.

Representative ANGELL. What has been your experience in the operation of the gross-income tax?

Mr. BORTHWICK. It is the finest tax in the world, Mr. Angell, that I have ever seen.

Representative ANGELL. Explain just briefly how it operates.

Mr. BORTHWICK. It is a privilege tax. A man pays a dollar for a license to engage in business. All types of business are taxed. It is now $1\frac{1}{2}$ percent.

Representative ANGELL. One and one-half percent of what?

Mr. BORTHWICK. Of the gross take. It is a gross-receipts tax.

Representative ANGELL. In the nature of a sales tax?

Mr. BORTHWICK. No. It is not, because lawyers, preachers, shoe shiners—everybody comes under it. They don't come under the sales tax. A sales tax is a penalty for purchasing. That is after the man has put everything that he can think of in there, overhead and everything, then the company pays the tax on that man's expenses. That is not true of the gross income tax.

Representative ANGELL. What are the mechanics of enforcing the tax?

Mr. BORTHWICK. If the man is in the grocery business, and he sells a thousand dollars worth of groceries, he pays \$15. The sugar companies pay $1\frac{1}{2}$ percent, that is in the price of shipped sugar. The pineapple company pays the same rate.

Representative ANGELL. When are these payments made?

Mr. BORTHWICK. They are supposed to be made monthly, on or about the 20th of the month after it becomes due.

Representative ANGELL. What is the percentage of your total tax that is included in that so-called gross income tax?

Mr. BORTHWICK. It has increased very much, Mr. Angell. I think I have a chart here that shows.

Representative ANGELL. I was just interested in knowing roughly.

Mr. BORTHWICK. Well, in 1938 the gross income tax was 19 percent.

Representative ANGELL. Of your total tax take?

Mr. BORTHWICK. Yes.

Representative ANGELL. 19 percent.

Mr. BORTHWICK. In 1944 it was $26\frac{1}{2}$ percent.

Representative ANGELL. Does that meet with the general favorable approval of the citizenry?

Mr. BORTHWICK. I know of no prominent businessman, or what I would term a reasonable businessman but what would vote, in my opinion, to sustain it, and keep it on the books. It has met with the most universal approval of any tax we have.

Representative TAYLOR. You say the taxpayer has a right to review. How does he do that, by a writ of certiorari?

Mr. BORTHWICK. He comes in and files a claim, and he may appear before the board of review to state why he thinks his property is not worth the assessed value. He then has a hearing.

Representative TAYLOR. And after the hearing does he have any other recourse beyond that?

Mr. BORTHWICK. Well, of course, he may appeal to the court.

Representative TAYLOR. Does he do that by a writ of certiorari on a review of your action or the board's action?

Mr. BORTHWICK. Yes. That has been done.

Representative TAYLOR. Do you have many instances of that?

Mr. BORTHWICK. Not many.

Representative TAYLOR. How do you assess, on a 100-percent true value, or a lesser amount?

Mr. BORTHWICK. We may assess on 50 percent of the actual cash value to the property as a rule.

Representative TAYLOR. Do you have such a thing as a grievance committee, where you hear these objections to your assessments?

Mr. BORTHWICK. We have a grievance committee, that is, pretty nearly any time.

Representative TAYLOR. Have you opened your books for inspection after the assessment has been made?

Mr. BORTHWICK. Anybody can see it. That is a public record. Anybody can see it.

Representative TAYLOR. After that, he may appeal to you?

Mr. BORTHWICK. He may appeal.

Representative TAYLOR. For some review of your decision as to this tax?

Mr. BORTHWICK. Yes.

Delegate FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask if it is not true that he is, in a large measure, responsible for the present tax system of the Territory.

Mr. BORTHWICK. Well, I am accused of it by pretty nearly everybody. I suppose I am.

Delegate FARRINGTON. You will admit that you are largely responsible for it?

Mr. BORTHWICK. Yes.

Delegate FARRINGTON. In the development of that tax system, or some of it, can you state some of the national experts that were called into consultation for the record?

Mr. BORTHWICK. Just before I came in, Mr. Fairchild of Yale or Harvard had been down and experted us. Mr. Stafford had experted us. A professor from Princeton was down here and stayed some months, and added his views to the situation. His name was Harley L. Lutz.

Delegate FARRINGTON. In other words, the Territory went to what it considered the ablest men in the country, who assisted in drafting a system of taxation?

Mr. BORTHWICK. I think that they did.

Delegate FARRINGTON. Now, can you state briefly the experience of the Territory under that system of taxation since 1934, and how that compares with the States? You will remember, of course, that that was for the most part a period of depression.

Mr. BORTHWICK. Well, I have had the privilege, as I said, of attending the National Tax Association, and have explained the tax system here, and have been congratulated on how well it has worked. I have been told by a great many of the tax commissioners that they wished that they could get it in their own States.

Delegate FARRINGTON. Isn't it true that the Territory has never defaulted on a bond or obligation of any kind, nor has it failed to meet its obligations to its employees, and that every pay roll has been met, and met on time?

Mr. BORTHWICK. They have been met. The pay was reduced, of course, but that was probably universal during the depression. The pay of the Territorial employees was reduced 10 percent, and the automatic increase in salaries was abolished, until we got the gross income tax, and it was soon after restored to them. Until we got the gross income tax each session of the legislature had appropriated a quarter of a million dollars for paying interest on borrowings for the pay roll. Since we have gotten the gross income tax they have never borrowed a thin dime, to my knowledge.

Delegate FARRINGTON. Now, when we set up the original system, I mean the present system of land taxation, it provided that assessments should be changed no more often than once in 4 years?

Mr. BORTHWICK. That is true, unless use and condition changed.

Delegate FARRINGTON. In the last legislature that was changed?

Mr. BORTHWICK. It was made 1 year.

Delegate FARRINGTON. Yes, it was made 1 year. I bring that out for the purpose of answering some of the questions that were asked.

Mr. BORTHWICK. Yes, we will have it annually in place of every 4 years.

Delegate FARRINGTON. Isn't it true that the gross income tax that is being used by the Territory is not only generally accepted as an excellent method of taxation, but has attracted considerable attention in the States, and at least one State has adopted its principles?

Mr. BORTHWICK. Indiana has it. West Virginia has something analogous to it.

Delegate FARRINGTON. You have received inquiries from all over the country for information on that tax?

Mr. BORTHWICK. Yes. I have voluminous correspondence about it.

Delegate FARRINGTON. Including inquiries from members of the House Committee on Ways and Means of Congress?

Mr. BORTHWICK. Yes. I have.

Delegate FARRINGTON. Now, Mr. Borthwick, during the course of the last 2 years, at least, there have been coming from the Territory from particularly war workers here, very serious protests against the 2 percent withholding tax?

Mr. BORTHWICK. Yes.

Delegate FARRINGTON. Concerning that tax I would like to ask you to make a very brief statement and cover in the record, if you will, a rather complete statement of the Territory's position on that tax, as it has been the source of a great deal of controversy, and has been urged by some of the people who have come here as a reason why we should not be given the responsibility of statehood. [See statement No. 31.]

Mr. BORTHWICK. Well, it is a gross income tax on compensation and dividends. Dividends were not considered to be taxable under the gross income, or on business gross income. In 1943 the legislature repealed the poll tax. We had, what had been passed in 1933, a relief tax of one half of 1 percent. That was abolished, that is, so far as the special tax was concerned. A tax of 2 percent was levied upon dividends, and upon services and compensation for services rendered within the Hawaiian Islands. It was levied on the people of Hawaii, and everybody working here. It raised a furor, because there were people coming down here who had not been told about it. There were

many people coming down here who had never made a decent salary in their lives, and they thought that they ought to go away with all the money that they got.

The Federal Government had sent in over a hundred thousand people, and our expenses had mounted, mounted, and mounted and something had to be done. Our income tax was copied after the Federal income tax. That is, the money that you made in 1944, for instance, was reported in 1945. You could pay that off in four quarterly installments. This money that you earned in January of 1944 would not be subject to be paid on until December of 1945, or 23 months thereafter. We were running behind. People were working 12, 14, and 16 hours a day, and they could not come to the tax office to make a report, so the tax office was kept open on Saturdays and Sundays to help them. The legislature finally passed a 2 percent flat tax on compensation and dividends, to be withheld by the employer. We could not get the Federal Government to withhold it, although the Federal Government made the Territory withhold from its employees 20 percent.

As I said, the people who had come here made lots of money, and I really mean lots of money. To illustrate, there was one young fellow who came in and objected to the tax; he didn't like to pay 2 percent. He had never paid a tax before. I asked him: "How much did you make before you came down here?" He said, "I made \$40 a month." I said, "How much did you make for the last year?" He said, "\$4,220." He was a mere boy, hardly old enough for the draft.

At this time we were in distress. We needed money. We needed it then as the months went by. This was the measure that was taken to get it. I might say that the city of Philadelphia has a gross income tax of the same character.

Chairman MILLER. You say, Mr. Borthwick, that your assessed valuation on real estate is on a 50 percent basis?

Mr. BORTHWICK. Well, approximately it is. Now, it is not always, there are exemptions that we have.

Chairman MILLER. Would a reassessment of properties, for instance, might it increase the valuation, due to this late effort down here, and relieve some of this situation down here, and make it unnecessary to add the 2 percent tax?

Mr. BORTHWICK. No. It would not. You would not be able to collect that at the time. You would not collect it by the month. That is collected semiannually. It would not have answered the question, because besides those people who are working here, we have our own people. We have people who lived here and have lived here 10 or 15 or 20 years, who vote, and are registered voters in the cities. They draw a nice salary, but they do not domicile themselves here. They would say, "I don't live here. This is not my home. I don't owe you fellows anything." This has forced everybody. Of course, I will admit there have been objections by our own people, but there is no tax on the statute books that was ever written by anybody but what somebody has objected to it, at least, I never heard of it.

Chairman MILLER. I was principally interested in the assessed valuation of real property. What effort did you make, or have you

made, to assess real property to keep it current with its present value?

Mr. BORTHWICK. Well, we have made every effort that was admitted under the law.

Chairman MILLER. What restrictions could be put in by law? Suppose I own a piece of property that by virtue of increased population and increased business has increased in value in the last 2 or 3 years, can't you go in and reassess it?

Mr. BORTHWICK. We can annually now. Before we were estopped unless the use or condition of that property had been changed; we could only assess each 4 years. That was because when we first started out putting an ad valorem tax on the land, there were no maps of the island. We didn't know the area that was owned by the plantation, and there just wasn't anything practical. It had to start from scratch.

Chairman MILLER. You had that information in the last 4 or 5 years?

Mr. BORTHWICK. We have just got that completed in the last year.

Chairman MILLER. A case was called to my attention during the noon hour, and I thought I would ask you about it.

Mr. BORTHWICK. Yes.

Chairman MILLER. They spoke of a piece of property owned by the McCandless estate, known as Waianae property. What was the assessed valuation of that property that was sold to the Federal Government?

Mr. BORTHWICK. I couldn't tell you that without looking it up.

Chairman MILLER. What price did they get from the Federal Government, that is?

Mr. BORTHWICK. I don't know. I didn't know that they even sold it.

Chairman MILLER. I was told that they asked \$500,000 for it, and that they got \$300,000, and that the assessed valuation of the property was \$56,000?

Mr. BORTHWICK. That could be.

Chairman MILLER. Well, on a 50-percent basis the property was then valued at about \$112,000?

Mr. BORTHWICK. Yes.

Chairman MILLER. Wouldn't your office, in picking up the spread between \$112,000 and \$300,000, in assessing the property for \$150,000, if that was the value of the property, have relieved the tax situation here?

Mr. BORTHWICK. Well, it might have in that particular instance. Yes.

Chairman MILLER. Would you say that—if those facts that I have cited here are correct—would you say that is an isolated instance?

Mr. BORTHWICK. Well, it probably is, of any large piece of property.

Chairman MILLER. Any other questions?

Representative DELANEY. May I ask you what was the total of the assessed valuation of all the Territory when you took office in 1934?

Mr. BORTHWICK. I haven't that figure, Mr. Delaney, with me.

Representative DELANEY. You do not know what the total assessed valuation was in 1934?

Mr. BORTHWICK. No.

Representative DELANEY. What was the total assessed valuation in 1945?

Mr. BORTHWICK. Mr. Crozier probably has those figures. [See exhibit 5F.]

Chairman MILLER. We will take a 5-minute recess at this time.

(Mr. Borthwick was excused and withdrew.)

(A recess was taken at this time until 3:15 p. m.)

AFTER RECESS

(Representative Miller, chairman pro tempore.)

Chairman MILLER. The hearing will come to order. Will you submit that information for the record, Mr. Borthwick?

Mr. BORTHWICK. Yes.

Chairman MILLER. And I would suggest that you file this document, the Chart of Territorial Tax System. [See exhibit 5F.]

Mr. BORTHWICK. Yes. I think you have that. I would like to say, Mr. Delaney, that the real property tax is a city and county realization, and does not affect the revenue of the Territory.

Chairman MILLER. Judge, will you call your next witness, please, and after that we will bring back Mr. Borthwick.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I would like to call Mr. Campbell Crozier, who is the special deputy of Mr. Borthwick, on the subject of real estate assessments.

Representative LARCADE. May I interrupt. I would like to ask to present, for the purposes of the record, a letter from a citizen of Honolulu requesting that night sessions be held by this committee in order to give the school teachers an opportunity to appear before the committee.

Chairman MILLER. It will be received and made a part of the record. (The memorandum reads as follows:)

Memorandum: Delegate Farrington.

Representative LARCADE: The following message was received at the Republican Club this morning at 12:35:

Lucile E. Hodgins, 2315 Leola Rise, Manoa 5, T. H., teacher at McKinley High School, requests on behalf of herself and other teachers and professional and business women that some statehood hearings be held in the evenings because many business people are unable to attend during day hearings.

M. L. NOONAN, *Secretary*.

JANUARY 9, 1945.

Representative LARCADE. Also a resolution in regard to the Bernice Pauahi Bishop estate by the Kamehameha Alumni Association, and others, printed in the Honolulu Advertiser.

Chairman MILLER. It will be made a part of the record, at this point.

(The Honolulu Advertiser notice referred to reads as follows:)

RESOLUTION IN REGARDS TO BERNICE PAUHAH BISHOP ESTATE

The undersigned associations, namely, the Kamehameha Alumni, the Kamehameha Alumnae, and the Parent-Teacher Associations of the Kamehameha high schools and the Kamehameha Preparatory School, believe that there is a definite move to break up the Bernice Pauahi Bishop estate by forcing it through legislation to sell the lands that produce the income which supports the Kamehameha schools, and that Governor Ingram M. Stainback, as indicated by his public utterances, approves of this movement.

Because of widespread incorrect information, many people in this community seem to share the view of the Governor and entertain the belief that the incon-

venience and misery resulting from the present shortage of dwellings in the city of Honolulu should be laid at the door of the Bishop estate. Therefore, the following facts are being presented for the information of the general public:

The Bishop estate lands were originally the property of Kamehameha I and by descent became the property of Princess Ruth Keelikolani, his great-granddaughter. She willed this property to her cousin, Princess Pauahi, another great-granddaughter of Kamehameha I, who was the last of the Kamehameha dynasty. Princess Pauahi married Charles R. Bishop, one of Honolulu's leading businessmen and philanthropists.

Princess Pauahi placed all the Kamehameha lands she had inherited in a charitable trust, naming as sole beneficiary the Kamehameha Schools for Boys and Girls, primarily for those of Hawaiian ancestry. Her expressed desire, as set forth in her will which created the trust, was to provide opportunity to train the children of her race to be "good and industrious men and women," with special emphasis on character development, spiritual education, and training in the industrial and vocational arts.

The Kamehameha Schools endeavor to carry out the objects of the trust and meet the growing educational needs of Hawaiian children. The enrollment has increased from 450 before the war to the present figure of 772. According to public declarations of the trustees, the enrollment will be increased to at least 1,500 as building facilities become available.

In the boys' school there are three curricula or programs of education, viz.: (a) The industrial arts and trades program by which the boys learn the vocations of carpentry, machinists, auto mechanics, electricity, sheet metal and welding, masonry, painting, motors and engines, with academics being closely related to the needs and demands of these vocational courses; (b) college preparatory courses for boys who wish to extend their training into college; and (c) a general course.

In the girls' school the students are trained in the home arts, such as cooking, sewing, practical nursing, and dietetics. In addition, bookkeeping, shorthand, typing, and similar subjects are offered for those who plan to enter the commercial field. Those who desire to go to college take additional courses required for higher education.

Special emphasis is given to health education and to spiritual values. The fine arts, such as music, both vocal and instrumental, painting, dramatics, and other similar creative activities, are also stressed.

The Bishop estate lands comprise a very large area. Approximately 86 percent of this area is comprised of forest reservations, mountain tops, lava flows, and other waste lands, which yield little revenue, about 2 percent of the annual rental income of the estate. The areas that produce the income which supports the Kamehameha Schools are mainly on Oahu. Any attempt to liquidate these lands for home sites or any other purpose would deprive the Kamehameha Schools of their very existence.

Contrary to popular belief, the estate has sold lands in fee for homesites when the growth of the city and the demand for house lots appeared to justify such a course in the interests of the estate. Following are subdivisions in this category under which some 1,650 fee-simple residential lots were added to the city of Honolulu:

	<i>Acres</i>
Beach Walk tract, Waikiki.....	10
McInerny tract, Kapalama.....	152
Bingham Park tract, Kapaaakea.....	26
Nioloa and Kawananakoa, Nuuanu Avenue.....	20
Manoa Uplands, Manoa Valley.....	17
St. Louis Heights, Kaimuki district.....	68
Others (Kamehameha Park tract, Dole St.).....	8

The housing problem in Honolulu, which was brought about by war conditions, is a complicated and difficult one and cannot be resolved by simply breaking up trusts and liquidating estates. Before attempting any such radical step as has been proposed, the Territorial Government should put on the market its available acres of home-site property in and about Honolulu. In any event, the placing of new subdivisions for sale on the market is necessarily dependent not only on the availability of labor and material but on action by governmental authorities in providing water, sewers, lights, and roads. The housing problem, therefore, is a community responsibility, and calls for constructive leadership and cooperation.

Furthermore, there are hundreds of acres in rural Oahu from 10 to 15 driving miles from the heart of the city that could be readily converted into excellent residential areas. Also, there are many vacant lots in Honolulu owned by private individuals which could be used for home sites.

An illustration of the disastrous effects of the sale of income-producing land of an eleemosynary trust is shown by the history of the Lunalilo estate. By an unfortunate provision in King Lunalilo's will, the trustees were directed to sell the lands belonging to the estate and to invest the proceeds to maintain the Lunalilo Home for Aged Hawaiians. The result is that the Lunalilo trust itself is now an object of charity.

The undersigned associations deem the Kamehameha schools and the Bishop estate the heritage of the Hawaiian people. They are not asking the government or any institution to give the Hawaiians something. All they ask is that the lands which are already theirs be left to them intact and free from jeopardy so that the objects of the Bernice Pauahi Bishop estate trust may be fulfilled.

The Kamehameha schools are serving a very real community need in carrying a share of the educational burden, which in itself lightens the taxpayers' annual bill. In addition, the Bishop estate pays one-half million dollars in taxes annually.

Educational history in the United States shows that there has been a tendency for wealthy estates to endow institutions of learning. So far as can be ascertained, no legislative action has ever been taken in any part of the United States to break up such endowments. Therefore, must the Bishop estate and its Hawaiian heirs be used as a proving ground to determine whether legislative action designed to liquidate the lands of such a charitable trust can become a legal precedent?

The educational privilege which the Hawaiians enjoy under the Bishop estate is in accord with traditional national thought. For instance, the American people, who have willingly sacrificed sons and daughters to help establish justice in the world, have recognized the principle that native races—such as the American Indians and Hawaiians—are entitled as a birthright to the large land areas accorded them. In the case of the Hawaiians, particularly, extensive lands are set aside for them under the Hawaiian Homes Act passed by Congress: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the undersigned associations do hereby place themselves on record as being unalterably opposed to any current or future move, by legislation or otherwise, to break up the Bernice Pauahi Bishop estate by forcing it to liquidate its principal income-producing lands, thus curtailing and destroying the operation of the Kamehameha schools.

Resolved further, That copies of this resolution be sent to Gov. Ingram M. Stainback, the president of the Territorial senate, and the speaker of the house of representatives, and all other Hawaiian organizations, and that copies for publication be sent to the Honolulu Advertiser and the Honolulu Star-Bulletin.

Dated: Honolulu, T. H., December 31, 1945.

The Kamehameha Alumni Association, by George A. K. Kahaiwai, president; The Kamehameha Alumnae Association by Louis P. D. Meurlott, president; Parent-Teacher Association of the Kamehameha High Schools, by Clinton Kanahale, president; Parent-Teacher Association of the Kamehameha Preparatory School, by John T. Ferreira, Jr., president.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Crozier, will you state to the committee who and what you are.

Mr. DELANEY. We will waive the qualifications, in order to expedite the matter.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Will you state, Mr. Crozier, to the committee here, what the process is in the assessment of real estate.

Mr. CROZIER. My name is Campbell Crozier. I am the deputy tax commissioner, in charge of the real and personal property of the Territory under Mr. Borthwick, the tax commissioner.

All the real and personal property of the Territory is under the jurisdiction of the tax commissioner, although the moneys received from real and personal property are allocated to the counties 100 percent for their finances, at no expense to the counties.

Prior to 1933 we treated our real and personal property under two methods of taxation; real and personal property in business was treated under what is known as the enterprise for profit theory. The earnings were taken and studied, along with the assets, and the rate of capitalization arrived at, to arrive at the capital value of the real and personal property. Then we had a man's home, an individual holding in the country, which was on the so-called *ad valorem* basis; an *ad valorem* tax.

Prior to 1942 we had four taxes, and out of them there were two of them, real and personal, carrying about 80 percent of the revenues for both the Territory and the counties, and we went through the same condition of the general property tax carrying the great load of the cost of the government, and we had the same experiences that were being experienced in the States after the crash of 1929. We then decided we had to mend our ways, to relieve the real property of the general property tax and of its heavy burden, and to shift it to other sources of taxation. At that time, in 1929, we had four taxes—the real, personal, net income, and a poll tax—and we went through this depression and under the conditions prevailing we made a thorough study of our taxation, hiring, as Mr. Borthwick says, Professor Fairchild, the noted tax economist of Yale, and a number of other experts, and we checked over our whole taxation structure. Beginning with January 1934, we passed a new and modern, we might say, real property tax law. In the year 1933 we relieved personal property, whether used in business or owned by an individual, such as his watch, or furniture and fixtures, of any personal property taxes. We picked up a net income tax and a fuel tax and a number of other miscellaneous taxes to meet our requirements. We subsequently, in 1934, since that date have gone back to the personal property tax, but which only affects personal property in business. We relieved the individual of being taxed on his watch and on his household effects and his furniture and fixtures, and today personal property held by an individual or by a corporation that is not in business is not subject to the personal property tax.

Getting back to our real property tax, we realized that a great number of taxpayers throughout the Territory, and especially on the outside islands, were formerly under the enterprise for profits tax, and that we lacked the items we needed to be taken into account in order to arrive at an *ad valorem* tax, such as the number of acres and the numbers of improvements thereon. A special committee that had studied our revamping of our tax structure—that was put into effect in 1942, January 1, 1942—had made a comprehensive study of the various real property taxes throughout the States, and it was decided that the tax commissioner, that one man would be vested with full authority to raise all the taxes designated to the tax office, and in each case he has the full authority of assessing and collecting all taxes in all our different counties, and his orders or rules and regulations are given to the assessors of our various counties. Under our system of handling the real property tax, and we are proud of our real property tax law, in view of the fact that the methods we use in determining the values, and our method of handling the tax-paying public is more than fair. At first, not having the maps and the information needed, it was decided at that time to go on a 4-year cycle of valuation while

we picked up the facts, and, as stated by Mr. Borthwick, since 1934 we have had three 4-year cycles and we feel now we can carry the assessments annually and keep pace with the ups and downs of real-estate cycles.

We start out in the 4-year cycle 6 months prior to the assessable year and we hold meetings in the different districts. We start out with commercial areas and we spread out from one end of an island to the other. At that time we go through the districts and ask all interested parties, both by invitation and by correspondence, and by means of the press, to attend our meetings. Quite often we have the meetings in the actual areas and the taxpayer at that time is asked to come forward and express his ideas of value, and they are taken up by the assessor before the rolls are closed.

We have a home exemption here which is rather liberal, in many cases reducing the taxes to a very small amount; small homes, the land and buildings that are less than \$1,500 are fully exempt, and then it is on a sliding scale up to \$5,000, on which the home exemption, the maximum, is \$3,250, and if a man owns a home having a value greater than \$5,000, that \$3,250 is like a warrant, and relieves him of paying some \$93 per year. We assess only on a calendar basis, and we assess as of January 1, 1946, for the year 1946, paying our taxes in two installments for 1946, in June and November. During the 6 months that we have just gone through, from July 1945 to the end of the year, we have gone through the list and have thoroughly revised all of our valuations. We have held gatherings on this island from one end of the island to the other and had our meetings, and have contacted all those people who are interested in values that we could, and they have been asked to come to these meetings and to participate in them, because under Mr. Borthwick's administration he has always felt that it is the public's job, if you want a low tax value and a high rate, or if you want a high tax value and a low rate.

We have done one thing more here, when we changed our tax structure, and instead of running up the rate as so many States have done, we have written the amount into the law and have limited the counties to the amount of money to be raised from real property taxation, and so it has just been a question of mathematics, and if you have a low tax value, then your rate is high, and has to be high in order to raise the amount that is required to be raised from real property taxation.

Following that we took, in the month of January, the home exemptions, and in the month of March we notify the man of his assessment, and if he does not agree with the assessor he comes in and files an appeal, informally, by which he simply states, "I object to the assessor's valuation"; and shortly after that, after the roll has been made up, he has got to pay the taxes on the assessor's value, to start with, which is in June, and shortly after, in July, our informal board of three businessmen sits with all the persons whose appeals have been filed, the appeals filed by the aggrieved taxpayers, and they deal with these three men, who make a finding, and if the taxpayer is not satisfied with the decision he can appeal to the tax appeal court, which is a judicial court of record, and if he is not satisfied with the decision there he can appeal to our local supreme court, and if he is

not satisfied there he can go on to the ninth circuit court of appeals, and if not satisfied he can go on to the Supreme Court of the United States.

Representative DELANEY. When you revised your tax method you relieved the real-property owners of a great deal of taxes; is that right?

Mr. CROZIER. That is correct. I could mention, in my own case —

Representative DELANEY. Well, if you will just follow my questions we will get along very nicely. I understand that the great mass of people here own approximately 8.7 percent of the land, is that right? Approximately, that is. We are not going to bother about a few points there. Say less than 10 percent of the land?

Mr. CROZIER. I cannot say, offhand, Mr. Delaney, what it is.

Representative DELANEY. You have been familiar with these land holdings for a long time?

Mr. CROZIER. That is correct.

Representative DELANEY. And I didn't come here until the other day, and I am somewhat familiar with the conditions here today, and surely you must be.

Mr. CROZIER. Yes.

Representative DELANEY. Now, the large holders of land own over 90 percent of the land, is that right?

Mr. CROZIER. Throughout the Territory?

Representative DELANEY. Yes.

Mr. CROZIER. That is subject to the private ownership; including corporations and estates?

Representative DELANEY. That's right.

Mr. CROZIER. I should imagine that is about correct, yes.

Representative DELANEY. And there are less than 100 people or 100 corporations or groups that own about 90 to 95 percent of the land?

Mr. CROZIER. I would not say it is that high.

Representative DELANEY. Well, all right. Would you say 90 percent of the land? We are not going to figure too closely.

Mr. CROZIER. It is somewhere in that neighborhood.

Representative DELANEY. We are not going to figure to the exact percentage. Isn't that right?

Mr. CROZIER. That's right.

Representative DELANEY. When you revised your tax method you relieved these large tax owners, didn't you?

Mr. CROZIER. That is correct.

Representative DELANEY. And the great masses of the public were forced to pay an additional tax?

Mr. CROZIER. That is correct.

Representative DELANEY. That is all I wanted.

Chairman MILLER. Are there any questions?

Representative ANGELL. Do you have any explanation of that statement?

Mr. CROZIER. It eventually comes back to your sources of taxation, and those who are receiving the benefits of your government.

Representative ANGELL. It has been my information that your tax machinery here has worked very well and brought about an efficient and equitable distribution here compared with systems on the mainland. I am quite interested in having the information, and an

explanation, if you have one, of that statement, and I don't think one or two questions dropped about the large owners being here and not being subject to tax, or about their taxes being lessened, is sufficient to, in any way, explain the general machinery of your tax problem. I would like to know a little more about the workings of your whole tax system, and whether or not it has worked equitably, or whether it has worked inequitably as to assessments upon big owners or upon little owners.

Mr. CROZIER. Very few of the big owners actually pay the tax themselves. They are the landlords and are known as lessors, and the great majority, I should imagine it amounts to 90 percent of their land holdings, is under lease to individuals, and the individual eventually pays that tax. As we shifted from one tax system to another, in other words, and relieved the general property tax by \$1, and picked up the 50 cents from one source, and from another, the big owners actually did not benefit thereby; it was their tenants who had borne the burden of the real-property taxes that were assessed against our big owners, and so based on the tax to the actual tenants it was like shifting from one pocket to another, so to speak.

Representative ANGELL. But the question of a lower assessment, or the assessed value of the real property, does not, according to my thinking, enter into the question of the amount that the taxpayer is going to pay in taxes, because if you split in two the assessed value and double your rate, he will pay the same tax.

Mr. CROZIER. That is correct. It is just a matter of equity.

Representative ANGELL. So you might assess land at \$10 an acre and then put on a rate of tax sufficient to bring in the total tax revenue you have designed to collect from real property, and you would bring in just the same amount; it would be just as equitable to have the value of the land assessed at \$100 an acre, and then lower the rate?

Mr. CROZIER. That is correct, sir.

Representative ANGELL. We have the same problem in my State. The ultimate burden of the taxpayer is the same whether you are paying on a 50-percent valuation, or whether you are paying on a 10-percent valuation; it just means that you have a higher tax rate in one case and a lower tax rate in the other; isn't that correct?

Mr. CROZIER. That is correct.

Chairman MILLER. I think that is true in my State, in California, too, but, on the other hand, the case that I cited, when there was a 50-percent value, and they assessed it on a 50-percent value, does not mean a \$56,000 assessment to a \$300,000 sale?

Mr. BORTHWICK. That was in 1930, wasn't it?

Representative ANGELL. That tax assessment, as I understand it, was made on prewar conditions, and they sold it at the high wartime prices.

Delegate FARRINGTON. I would like to ask Mr. Crozier if he intends to tell the committee that less taxes are yielded by the large tracts of land rather than the small tracts of land? It is very easy to conclude from what you say that the large holdings are not paying any taxes. Is that correct?

Mr. CROZIER. That is the large holdings in acreage; they have the majority of acreage, but many of their lands are in the forest reserves and in the sides of the mountains, and in the lava flows on Hawaii,

where they pay a minority of the tax, and naturally that area is getting less benefits of government, and also it has less ability to pay, and we have tried at these various meetings on values, and anybody has a right to attend any county meetings or any district meetings, and to see that his area, Waikiki versus the city, for example, is treated equitably, and to say so if he thinks there is not a fair relationship established, so that in the end we have our relativity in the matter of assessments. Now we have all gone through this inflationary period, and it is causing a problem to come before every taxing official, here and throughout the mainland, as to what to do with the so-called war-inflated values.

Delegate FARRINGTON. Isn't the amount of real taxes paid actually dependent on the value of the property, and not, to a large extent, on the size of the property?

Mr. CROZIER. That is correct.

Delegate FARRINGTON. Isn't it a fair assumption to make from that, that in consequence of that policy the bulk of the real property taxes is yielded by the lands held by the 10 percent, to whom reference has been made, rather than to the lands held by the 100 individuals or groups that have 90 percent of our land?

Mr. CROZIER. That is correct, Mr. Farrington.

Chairman MILLER. Any other questions, gentlemen?

(No response.)

Mr. CROZIER. Mr. Chairman, may I answer Mr. Delaney's question, which was put just before the recess to Mr. Borthwick?

Chairman MILLER. Yes.

Mr. CROZIER. In 1944 the figure of the total assessed valuation on land was \$160,960,950, and in 1945, for the same figure, the net assessed value was \$210,909,382.

Delegate FARRINGTON. Could I ask Mr. Crozier to place in the record the amount of land on the island of Oahu, as measured by assessed value, that was held by the armed forces in 1933 and that is held today.

Mr. CROZIER. Yes.

Delegate FARRINGTON. That will show, Mr. Crozier, will it not, that the amount has increased from something like less than 10 percent up to close to 40 percent?

Mr. CROZIER. That is correct.

Delegate FARRINGTON. Now may I raise another question that might be illuminating, and that is that when you present the land situation of the Territory in terms of acreage held, you do not show the relative value of the holdings? In other words, while it may be true that 100 individuals and corporations hold 90 percent of the land, that it does not necessarily follow from that that they hold 90 percent of the land as measured by assessed value?

Mr. CROZIER. That is correct.

Delegate FARRINGTON. Now have you figures which will show the distribution of land ownership by assessed values?

Mr. CROZIER. Yes. There are certain schedules that have been compiled showing that. I don't know whether Mr. Tavares has introduced them as yet. If not, they will come in later, and they will show the islands of Hawaii, Maui, and Kauai, and the number of large ownerships of acreage, and the relative proportion or percentage of the

assessed value, and on the island of Oahu the general classification of those assessed values. (See exhibits 43 and 44.)

Delegate FARRINGTON. Will you also place in the record the tax rates that have prevailed in the different counties over the period of the last 8 years? [See exhibit No. 57.]

Mr. CROZIER. That can be done, Mr. Farrington.

Mr. ROBERTSON. May I ask Mr. Crozier a few questions, Mr. Chairman?

Chairman MILLER. Yes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I am sorry to have to take the time, but there are a few matters I wish to have cleared up.

Mr. Crozier, are you familiar with this volume, entitled: "An Historic Inventory of the Physical, Social, and Economic Resources of the Territory of Hawaii," which is published by the Territorial planning board?

Mr. CROZIER. I am.

Mr. ROBERTSON. On page 51 of that volume it is stated, under the head of "Land Owners," "Owned by the Government, 43.5 percent; owned by private individuals, 56.5 percent," and have you any reason for questioning the reliability of those figures?

Mr. CROZIER. No, sir, Judge.

Representative ANGELL. As of what date, Judge, is that valuation made?

Mr. ROBERTSON. In 1939—in accordance with Mr. Crozier's recent statement. Since then large areas have been taken by condemnation by the Federal Government for Army and Navy purposes, on this island, which would reduce the privately owned percentage and increase the publicly owned percentage.

I would like also to point out to the committee, on this same page of this book there is a break-down under the head of private land, 56.5 percent; and there is an item "largest owner, 9.1 percent," and presumably that is the Bishop estate.

Then the next item is "10 largest owners," including the largest owner, who own 28.6 percent.

The next item is 100 largest owners, including the 10 largest owners, 47.8 percent.

Other owners, 8.7 percent. They add up to 100 percent.

Mr. Crozier, let me ask you what part of the Government gets the benefit and use of the real property taxes?

Mr. CROZIER. One hundred percent of the revenues, which are set in amount by the legislature, goes to each of the respective counties.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Does the Territory have any of the real property revenue?

Mr. CROZIER. None at all.

Mr. ROBERTSON. It all goes to the counties?

Mr. CROZIER. One hundred percent goes to the counties. In fact, the tax commissioner's office administers all the assessing and collecting of real property, at no expense to the counties.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Now, isn't there a Territorial law that forbids the tax commissioner from assessing real estate at its value—cash value?

Mr. CROZIER. Our law says that real property shall be assessed at its fair, reasonable value. We define how you arrive at land value; rent, accessibility, topography, productivity, sale, and all the other fac-

tors which are all taken up at these various hearings, and we value buildings at 100 percent of their standing value, based on the average replacement value which is somewhat of an invariable amount.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I am referring to a more recent Territorial law. Isn't the tax commissioner precluded from raising more than a certain amount of dollars and cents by the taxation of land?

Mr. CROZIER. The amount raised is limited by statute, Judge.

Mr. ROBERTSON. And doesn't that statute prevent the commissioner from assessing land at its value, cash value, because of the limitation placed on him by that act?

Mr. CROZIER. Not exactly. The law says that the valuation placed on every ownership shall be the fair, reasonable value; the land value to be found by these factors, and the buildings to be found by other factors. Then the question comes, after you add up the 72,000 assessments throughout the Territory, or for this island 35,000, you add up your assessments, and then that ratio, into the amount to be raised, gives you your tax rate. If your value is low, and you raise \$4,000,000, your rate goes up, and if your value is high, you still by statute raise the \$4,000,000, and your rate goes down.

Representative ANGELL. It comes back to the point I was trying to make awhile ago; it is immaterial what value is placed on it if you are limited to the amount that is to be raised by real property.

Mr. CROZIER. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Crozier, this act tells the commissioner that he must not raise more than a certain number of thousands of dollars by the taxation of land on this island?

Mr. CROZIER. That is correct, Judge.

Mr. ROBERTSON. What is that limitation? How much is the commissioner bound down to?

Mr. CROZIER. For the last number of years it has been a maximum of \$4,000,000.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is for the Territory?

Mr. CROZIER. No; that is for the city and county of Honolulu.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Well, then, as a matter of fact, a full cash value of the real estate on the island of Oahu is more than \$4,000,000, isn't it?

Mr. CROZIER. Oh, yes, Judge; considerably more.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Well, doesn't that \$4,000,000 limitation then, which that law imposes on the tax commissioner, prevent the tax commissioner from assessing the land on this island at a figure that would produce more than \$4,000,000?

Mr. CROZIER. Judge, you have the two steps. The tax commissioner arrives at his net assessed value, and he takes the amount, as required by law, and the buildings come under that, and he fixes the assessed value. That valuation on each one of the 35,000 parcels on Oahu is added up and the ratio of \$4,000,000, the amount to be raised, to the total valuation as found by the assessor, determines your tax rate per thousand.

Mr. ROBERTSON. This statute that has had the result of keeping down real-estate assessments was the result of some agitation that came up here in Honolulu a few years ago, was it not?

Mr. CROZIER. Well, we follow the same cycle as used in California and the west coast, and while I was born and have been raised here,

and have been in the tax office 12 years, I have visited California and the west coast and have gone to a number of conventions, and our problems are not unique; we went through the same rise in value following out of the depression, and we came out of the slump in 1934 like what happened in many mainland communities, where they had their slump in 1929, and going on to 1933, and there probably was a time lag. We made our comprehensive valuation in July of 1941, and at the time of the meeting we had in that year we issued a prayer that we would not be attacked after April 20, 1942, the last day to appeal, because we had raised our values of 1941, for 1942, based on this 4-year rise, and we realized that if we had an attack that all our good work of 1941 would go out of the window, so to speak, and it did to a great extent. We had an attack here on December 7, and we had to take our study of the previous 5 months and notify the taxpayer that in March 1942 that the tax commissioner was optimistic by reason of his study of 1941, as to the levying of these high assessments, but the people said that property had no value. Now in our board of reviews we had 50 percent of our assessment appealed, and our board of reviews and the Tax Appeal Courts were inclined to lean, in my opinion, a little too far backward, because after the battle of Midway we had just gone stepping right along, until we are in this low ratio of present values.

Mr. ROBERTSON. My question, Mr. Crozier, was with reference to this comparatively recent law that limited the right of the assessor to raise the taxes on real estate. As a matter of fact, that did not result from any initiative of the Territorial government, but as a result of an agitation that began in the business community here, didn't it?

Mr. CROZIER. Judge, you have the two steps. The Tax Commissioner to find anything but the fair and reasonable value.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I understand that, but you admit, don't you, that the limitation of \$4,000,000 on this island precludes the assessor, the commissioner, from assessing land on this island at its full cash value?

Mr. CROZIER. Judge, it would not make any difference would it?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Whether it makes any difference or not, that is a fact, isn't it?

Mr. CROZIER. There is no limitation under the law. The tax commissioner would find lesser values by reason of the amount to be raised.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is what I am really talking about. The commissioner cannot raise more than \$4,000,000 in taxing land on this island, and admitting that, doesn't that result in the land being assessed at less than its value; its cash value?

Mr. CROZIER. No, Judge; not at all.

Representative MILLER. If you want to bring out anything, Judge, we can go on, but you and the gentleman here seem to be unable to agree on that point you are discussing. I wonder if we can go on to the next witness?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I think so.

Mr. CROZIER. Do you want me to file this as an exhibit, this study of land valuations by ownership.

Chairman MILLER. You can file it now, if you wish.
(Document offered, marked exhibits Nos. 43-44.)

Mr. BORTHWICK. May it please the committee, what Judge Robertson is trying to get at is: What was the limit I should raise for this

county. This limit is \$4,000,000, fixed by the legislature, and for the island of Maui it is \$770,000; they cannot raise any more than that, and for the county of Hawaii it is \$1,200,000 and for the county of Kauai it is \$550,000. That is the point of it. That is what Judge Robertson wanted to bring out by his questions to Mr. Crozier.

Chairman MILLER. Your next witness, please.

Mr. ROBERTSON. We next present Walter D. Ackerman, Jr., the Territorial treasurer.

Mr. WALTER D. ACKERMAN, JR. My name is Walter D. Ackerman. I was born in the Territory of Hawaii, and educated in the public and private high schools of the Territory, and of the State of California. I received a degree of bachelor of arts from Stanford University, and a legal degree from the same institution. I have been treasurer of the Territory, and, as such, insurance commissioner and bank examiner for the last 3 years. Prior to that I was deputy attorney general of the Territory for 3 years [reading]:

It is wholly within the province of our legislature to determine what governmental revenues shall flow to the counties and what shall constitute Territorial realizations. The organic act places no restriction on the legislature in that regard, and, hence, the legislature apportions the revenues, or sources of revenue, as between the Territory on the one hand and the counties on the other, all according to the respective needs of the two.

May I refer you to exhibit 5E, entitled "Chart of Territorial Tax System." This exhibit lists the various taxes which are administered: First, by the Territorial tax commissioner; second, by the Territorial treasurer; and third, by the counties. Revenues from taxes administered by the counties constitute county realizations and revenues from taxes administered by the tax commissioner and the treasurer, with certain exceptions, constitute Territorial realizations. The exceptions are two:

1. The proceeds of the real and personal property taxes administered by the tax commissioner are, under existing law, paid over, almost in toto, to each of the counties in which collection is made. This constitutes the main source of county revenue. In regard to this revenue, I might state that each county is limited under Territorial law as to the amount to be derived from real and personal property taxes. Thus, for example, the city and county of Honolulu, under present limitations, may raise no more than \$4,000,000 per year from real property taxes and no more than two-and-a-quarter-million dollars from personal property taxes. Procedurally, each county prepares a budget within its statutory limits, the tax commissioner assesses the various taxable properties in the county, and the budget amount divided by the assessed values makes for the county's tax rate. The taxes are collected by the Territorial tax commissioner, and are turned over to the Territorial treasurer for distribution to the various counties. The treasurer, however, under Territorial law, withholds therefrom sufficient to meet the interest and carrying charges on certain Territorial bonds issued for county purposes, sufficient to reimburse the Territory for any loans or advances made to the county during the year, and also sufficient to meet the county's determined contribution to the employees' retirement system of the Territory. The balance is paid over to the county, and Territorial law dictates a cer-

tain order of county expenditure. First in priority comes the county's bonds; then certain school expenses; then contributions to institutions as required by law; next expenditures for other designated purposes as mandated by the legislature; and lastly, expenditures for general county purposes.

2. The second exception to the rule that taxes administered by the tax commissioner constitute Territorial realizations is the liquid fuel tax. A portion of this tax is allocated to the counties to meet the interest and maturity requirements of county bonds issued for county highways. The remainder is deposited in two special funds—the Territorial highway fund and the Territorial airport fund, for certain highway and airport purposes.

Fixing the tax rates for the counties, distributing tax proceeds to them, and temporarily loaning them funds when they are in need and the Territory has a surplus constitute the principal fiscal contacts as between the Territory and the counties.

However, the Territorial treasury also acts as a depository for securities held by the counties, and pursuant to legislative authority, it often has floated Territorial bonds for county purposes and has thereafter made the necessary collections for payment of principal and interest from the counties.

The foregoing deals with the Territorial and county fiscal relations. Let us now discuss the funded debt. For a summary of this debt, I respectfully refer you to exhibit 5D. I might state at this point that never in the history of the Territory has there ever been any default in the said debt. Our bonds enjoy a very fine rating and we are able to float them at low rates of interest. For example, recently a block of Territory of Hawaii bonds which were due to mature in 4 years were purchased by banking interests at a price which would yield slightly less than three-fourth of 1 percent interest per year. Our transfer agent on the mainland is Bankers Trust Co., of New York City, and the principal holders of our bonds reside on the mainland. As you will note from exhibit 5D Territorial bonds outstanding as of December 31, 1945, totaled \$16,520,000, and sinking fund assets \$7,151,344, for a net bonded indebtedness of \$9,368,656. This present net bonded indebtedness of \$9,000,000 compares very favorably with our net bonded indebtedness in 1939 of \$28,000,000. Since 1939, we have consistently reduced our debt until we have attained this low figure, the reductions during the past year being especially rapid as a result of extra legislative appropriation.

Chairman MILLER. Are there any questions?

Representative ANGELL. Is the income from those bonds tax exempt?

Mr. ACKERMAN. Yes, they are, and to the same extent that bonds of States are tax exempt.

Representative ANGELL. Were those bonds you mentioned, selling at about three-fourths of 1 percent income long-term or short-term bonds?

Mr. ACKERMAN. They were 4-year bonds; very short term.

Chairman MILLER. Will you please present the next witness.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The next witness is Mr. Joseph Dickson, the Territorial auditor.

Mr. JOSEPH DICKSON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, my name is Joseph Dickson. I was born in Scotland and received my education there, qualifying as a chartered accountant. I came to Hawaii in

1930, was with one of the leading firms of certified public accountants in Honolulu for 5 years, then was chief accountant for Bernice P. Bishop estate for over 7 years. I am an American citizen by naturalization and a certified public accountant. I was appointed deputy auditor of the Territory of Hawaii, January 1, 1943, and was appointed auditor on July 12, 1944.

I wish to present a brief statement concerning the establishment of the accounting, budgeting, and reporting system now in use in the government of the Territory of Hawaii.

In 1923 the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii passed an act creating a Territorial commission on public accountancy, to which was entrusted the duty of establishing: A budget system, a modern accounting and reporting system, and a uniform business procedure in the Territorial and local governments of Hawaii.

The objects of such installations were: To furnish comprehensive data to the Governor, the administrative officers and the legislature as a means of securing economy in the operations of the government; to provide a means of controlling the activities of the departments and establishments; to supply data upon which to base estimates of department requirements; to secure uniformity in the business operations of government; and to cause the financial and other statistical data of Hawaii to be so classified that it would be comparable with like data furnished by the 48 States to the Federal Bureau of the Census.

In 1924 the Institute for Government Research of Washington, D. C., was requested by the Governor to undertake the task of formulating and installing a budget system and a uniform system of accounting, reporting, and business procedure for the Territorial government and its political subdivisions. Upon receipt of this request Mr. Henry P. Seidemann, certified public accountant, the institution's chief consulting accountant, was sent to Hawaii in July 1924, to take charge of this work as the technical director of the commission on public accountancy. He remained in the islands until September 1927, when, with the assistance of a technical staff, most of whom were recruited locally, this work was completed.

The commission on public accountancy on July 16, 1928, under its authority prescribed for use in the Territorial auditor's office, the Territorial treasurer's office and in the operating offices of the government of the Territory of Hawaii, a most comprehensive manual fully documented prepared by Mr. Seidemann and his staff. This manual is still the basis of the accounting, budgeting, and reporting system now in use in the Territorial government.

The classification of receipts and expenditures followed by the Territory of Hawaii, is similar to that established by the United States Bureau of the Census for the reporting of the financial statistics of States, while in general it may be said that the accounting, budgeting, and reporting system of the Territory of Hawaii conforms to the best practices of the most progressive States in the Union.

Permission is respectfully requested to file with your committee certain financial reports and statements in order that these may be available for reference.

These comprise exhibits No. 45: (45A) Report of the auditor to the Governor of Hawaii and the 1945 Legislature of Hawaii, for the biennium ended June 30, 1945, and the fiscal year ended June 30, 1944;

(45B) Consolidated balance sheet as of the close of the biennium ended June 30, 1945; (45C) Consolidated budget statement as of the close of the biennium ended June 30, 1945; (45D) Consolidated statement of operations, Territory of Hawaii, and its political subdivisions receipts and payments for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945; (45E) Consolidated statement of operations, Territory of Hawaii, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945; (45F) Comparative statement of cost of government services, Territory of Hawaii, and its political subdivisions for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1940, and June 30, 1945.

Chairman MILLER. Are there any questions? [No response.] Thank you very much, Mr. Dickson.

That is all we will have time for this afternoon, and we will continue with Mr. Chuck Mau tomorrow morning.

The meeting stands adjourned.

(Adjourned at 4 p. m., January 9, 1946, until 10 a. m., January 10, 1946.)

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII

THURSDAY, JANUARY 10, 1946

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE TERRITORIES,
Iolani Palace, Honolulu, T. H.

The committee met at 10 a. m., Hon. Henry D. Larcade (chairman) presiding.

Chairman LARCADE. The committee will come to order. At this time the chairman decides to yield the chair to the gentleman from New York, Mr. Taylor.

(Representative Taylor assumed the chair.)

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, we offer Mr. Chuck Mau, member of the Board of Supervisors of the city and county of Honolulu.

Mr. MAU. Mr. Chairman, gentlemen of the committee, my name is Chuck MAU. I was born here. Although I do not fancy being called anything but an American, a citizen of Hawaii and a citizen of the United States, the obvious fact remains, however, and I'm sure that you gentlemen would like to know, that I am of Chinese descent. I received my grammar- and high-school education here. I attended the University of Colorado, a State institution, from which I obtained my arts and law degree. By profession I am a lawyer. I have served in the capacity of a deputy in the office of the attorney general here in the Territory. I first held public elective office in 1941, following the election of 1940, when I first ran for public office and was elected as a supervisor. I am now serving in that capacity in my third term. I am here at the request of Lester Petrie, mayor of the city and county of Honolulu, to present the facts relating to the city and county government. Since that government in all of its ramification is so extensive and it will be impossible for me to give you the whole picture in a brief statement that I am to make, I have brought with me my battery of experts who will attempt to answer any questions you gentlemen desire to propound concerning the city and county government.

Pursuant to the power in the organic act, being an act of Congress, the Territorial legislature created four political subdivisions, namely, the counties of Hawaii, Maui, and Kauai, and the city and county of Honolulu. The latter came into existence in 1905. In 1907 the legislature increased the jurisdictional area of the then county of Oahu and established the present city and county of Honolulu. Since the city and county is a creature of the legislature, all of its powers emanate from the legislature. The city and county consists of this island, the island of Oahu, and all other islands in the Territory, not included in the other named counties. The population of the city

and county is approximately, in round figures, 350,000. The governmental structure of the city and county follows the pattern of larger city and county governments on the mainland. It is headed by the mayor and a seven-member board of supervisors, elected for a 2-year term by citizens of the United States resident in this city and county. There are four other elective offices, also for a 2-year term, and they are the treasurer, the clerk, the auditor and the sheriff. Among the appointive department heads are the city and county attorney, the controller, the engineer, the superintendent of buildings, the fire chief, the physician, and the public prosecutor, who are appointed by the mayor, subject to confirmation by the board of supervisors. The powers of the board of supervisors of the city and county government, rather, are very broad concerning local matters covering those on health and fire and police protection. I will not at this time go into the details of those powers and functions of the government, since they are listed in my written brief, which I will file with the committee.

I would like to call your attention to the salaries we pay to our department heads. The present average salary is \$10,300 per annum. Checking with the Municipal Yearbook of 1944, we find that these salaries are considerably higher than those paid to similar city and county officials in the cities and counties of equivalent population on the mainland. It is the thought of the city and county administration that in order to attract qualified and able men into government service, we must be willing to pay for their qualifications and ability.

The financial structure of the city and county differs from the mainland counties, in that it does not have tax-levying powers. Our revenues are derived from legislative acts. Sixty-six percent of the revenues of the city and county come from the real and personal property taxes mentioned here yesterday. Out of the real property taxes the city received last year and will receive this year \$4,000,000, and out of the personal property taxes \$2,250,000. The other 34 percent of our revenue is derived from the franchise taxes, the license fees, including the motor-vehicle weight fees, district court fines and forfeitures, garbage-collection fees, and license fees received through the liquor commission. We will, or we have for the year 1945 a total revenue of \$9,442,000. That figure, coupled with several grants-in-aid from the Territory, and unappropriated surpluses from 1944, gave us in 1945 a total operating revenue of twelve-million-and-four-hundred-some-odd dollars. I might call your attention to just a few of the larger expenditures of the city and county.

Public safety, fire, police, traffic control, and other protection, two-million-five-hundred-thousand-some-odd dollars. Sanitation and waste removal, sewer system, street sanitation, waste collection and disposal, one-million-three-hundred-seventy-five-thousand-and-some-odd-hundred dollars. Schools, buildings, grounds and janitorial services, one-million-eighty-nine-thousand-some-odd-hundred dollars. Recreation, parks, playgrounds, and the Royal Hawaiian Band, \$565,000. Miscellaneous salary and wage adjustments, pensions, and so forth, \$2,400,000.

As indicative of the continued progress of the city and county administration, I would like to call your attention to two recent public-works projects. The first is the construction of two model incinera-

tors to dispose of garbage and rubbish through the process of incineration. The total cost of those two incinerators will go over \$1,000,000. Out of that the Federal Government has contributed or will contribute a total of over \$600,000. By the time the city and county completes the construction of those two incinerators, which we hope will be in March of this year, the city and county itself will have expended over half a million dollars. Recently I read an article in the magazine called *American City*, wherein it was reported that the city and county of Los Angeles is just beginning its campaign for several of these same model incinerators.

The other public-works projects concerns our sewage system. In 1943, the mayor and the board created the Honolulu Sewage Committee, the purpose of which was to study our sewage system. As a result of that study this committee and the board employed the nationally and internationally known sanitation firm of engineers, Metcalfe & Eddy, of Boston, Mass., who compiled a preliminary survey, costing the city close to \$100,000. Preliminary to that survey the city and county went to the legislature last year and asked for and obtained half a million dollars for a complete survey and the drawing of plans and specifications for a modern sewage system, estimated to cost \$15,000,000. This coming year, the city administration hopes to go before the legislature to ask assistance in financing this very vital project to the city.

I would like to touch upon the bonded indebtedness of the city and county. Under the organic act, providing the legislature gives its authorization, and providing the President of the United States consents, the city is authorized to issue bonds up to 5 percent of the assessed value of the real property in the county. The latest available figures as to the net assessable value of the real property in the city and county is \$146,750,000. This would allow a bond issue of \$7,337,000. As of December 1, 1945, the amount of outstanding general obligations of the city and county was \$6,539,000. Of this amount two-million-eight-hundred-and-some-odd-thousand dollars is an obligation of the board of water supply, a semiautonomous body, which provides each year from its revenue a sum sufficient to meet its obligation as to the interest and principal payments on its share of the bonds outstanding. So that in actuality, the bonded indebtedness of the city and county only amounts to three-million-seven-hundred-and-some-odd-thousand dollars. The city and county has never defaulted in the payment of interest or principal on any of its outstanding bond obligations, and has repeatedly received a substantial premium on the sale of its bonds. In its publication, *Manual of Government Securities*, American and Foreign, Moody's Investors Service of New York rates the general obligation bond of the city and county at A, which is the highest rating.

It is my belief that because of the financial standing of the city and county the Congress in 1935 passed an enabling act permitting the city and county to issue bonds beyond the 5 percent limitation contained in the organic act.

Another item of interest to this committee, I am sure, is that of rent control. The city and county was the first American community to put rent control into effect. The city and county rent-control ordinance was enacted immediately after the inception of the war,

and became effective on December 13, 1941. The local control of rent ceilings and of eviction of tenants has continued throughout the war and is still in effect. So far as we know, all other American communities which have become congested due to war conditions have been put under Federal OPA control through order of the President in establishing such localities as defense rental areas. However, the Federal Government after close scrutiny of our rental control ordinance and administration, has seen fit to leave such control in the hands of the city and county government. It may be of interest to this committee to know that the city and county administration was prepared for Pearl Harbor. Mayor Lester Petrie and the board of supervisors created a major disaster council, which was composed of top professional and businessmen, with funds provided by the board. The council purchased equipment, such as cots, splints, medicines, and other medical and hospital supplies. It also assisted in the organization and maintenance of a blood bank. When the infamous 7th came, it sprang into instant action. Its equipment and personnel, including blood plasma, were rushed to the aid of the military and naval services and civilian casualties. The result of this preparedness for this dire emergency should be recorded in local history and should be called to the attention of the Congress of the United States and to the people of the mainland. Thank you.

Chairman TAYLOR. Would you care to submit for the records any written memorandum you may have, Mr. Mau?

Mr. MAU. Yes, Mr. Chairman; I am submitting a written statement, together with two exhibits, the first being a statement of the revenues and expenditures of the city and county for the year 1945, prepared by the controller of the city and county, John MacLaren, and also the controller's report for 1944, which gives in detail all of the income expenditures and obligations of the city and county. [Statement No. 7, exhibits Nos. 46A and 46B.]

Chairman TAYLOR. If there is no objection, we'll have it. Are there any questions, gentlemen?

Representative LARCADE. May I question the witness, Mr. Chairman?

Chairman TAYLOR. Go ahead.

Representative LARCADE. Does the city and county have any postwar planning commission? Have they appointed such a committee?

Mr. MAU. We have a commission called the city planning commission. It has been in existence for some years. We have had our department heads working together with a committee of that sort appointed by the Governor of the Territory to consider postwar plans and postwar projects. I feel that we are definitely on the right track. We have now listed for large public works, to take up the slack, if at any time there should be unemployment or depression, to go ahead with those postwar plans and create employment.

Representative LARCADE. I think that's a very good idea, and you probably know, however, I called to your attention that the Congress has appropriated funds which are available through the Federal Works Agency to advance to various governmental subdivisions of the various States and Territories funds for the purpose of preparing plans and specifications and engineering fees for postwar planning.

Mr. MAU. We have at the present time made use of \$50,000 so made available by the Federal Government.

Representative LARCADE. Well, you have taken advantage of it?

Mr. MAU. Yes; we have not been asleep to the advantages we might gain.

Representative ANGELL. Mr. Mau, have you any system of old-age relief pension or that sort of thing in the Territory?

Mr. MAU. The Territory has what is known as the retirement system, to which all employees of the Territory and all of the counties belong. It has been made compulsory after 6 months of employment with the government. There is another class of employees, the old-timers, before this retirement system came into effect, who received pensions through another system. We have a commission now called the pension commission, taking care of the old-timers, like the firemen and the policemen and other old employees. In my exhibit, one of my exhibits, it will show how much we paid out in pensions to the old-time workers.

Representative ANGELL. Is that service supported by contributions both from the employees and the employer?

Mr. MAU. Not to the old-time employees. There was no such system whereby they contributed a certain amount of money and the government contributed a certain amount. But the present system, the retirement system, so-called, established by law, provides such a joint contribution between employee and the government.

Representative ANGELL. Do you have any system of relief for elderly people who do not come under the employees' compensation?

Mr. MAU. You mean, Mr. Angell, any—

Representative ANGELL. Any citizen.

Mr. MAU. Yes, there is such a system. It is under the department of public welfare. It is a Territorial agency, and if you will recall the tax official stating a certain percentage of the taxes collected, I think it comes now out of the 2-percent withholding tax, part of that money goes to the support of indigents or people who cannot take care of themselves.

Representative ANGELL. What are the qualifications for participating in that relief program? [See statement No. 14.]

Mr. MAU. I don't know if there are any restrictions of any kind.

Representative ANGELL. Isn't there an agency restriction?

Mr. MAU. Of that, I am not sure. Mr. John Wilson or some Territorial official could answer that question.

Representative ANGELL. What payments are made available, what monthly payments? [See exhibits Nos. 63B and 14i and j.]

Mr. MAU. That also I would not know in detail, since it is run by the Territory.

Representative ANGELL. You made a very excellent statement, Mr. Mau. I want to compliment you on the succinct and clear statement you made of the local government.

Mr. MAU. Thank you, sir.

Representative LARCADE. Mr. Chairman, may I ask another question?

Chairman TAYLOR. Please.

Representative LARCADE. For the record, how would statehood affect the finances of the city and county of Honolulu? Have you gone into that question?

Mr. MAU. One of the principal advantages to the city and county would be the taxing power, which we do not have now. I understand

that the county governments in the mainland do have the power to tax. The revenues that we get, we must come to the legislature for each session. We present our budget, the expectations of expenditures, and we take our chances with the legislature. If we were a county government, with the power to tax, we could raise our own money. I think it is a matter of public record that more than once the city and county has been denied funds it thought necessary to take care of the welfare of the people of this island, and there has been, I consider, quite an amount of discrimination insofar as revenues are concerned. In recent weeks I have made a study of the percentage of taxes collected by the whole Territory, and out of the whole collections, almost 90 percent comes from this island. But I doubt that, and I know it is not true, that we receive anywhere comparable to 90 percent of the taxes collected, to be spent on this island.

Representative LARCADE. Well, of course, if the Territory was admitted as a State, under your constitution that would have to be adopted, provision would be made for the methods to provide taxation to incur debt and issue bonds and under that procedure, why you would be able to overcome the question that you complain about, that you do not have sufficient funds under the present methods of taxation, and no doubt your constitution, when drawn up, will be comparable to that adopted by most of the other States, which provide methods for incurring debt by issuing bonds to provide for public and other improvements, schools, and so forth.

Mr. MAU. That is exactly correct.

Representative LARCADE. So, if that be true, you would benefit if the Territory was admitted as a State?

Mr. MAU. Yes, distinctly so.

Representative ANGELL. I wanted to ask about the financing of your school system. Did you cover that in your statement?

Mr. MAU. Yes; the city and county have only a limited obligation, so far as the schools are concerned. The city and county merely takes care of the construction of buildings and the acquisition of land and the maintenance of those buildings, all of the school buildings; with reference to the workings of the educational system, the city and county has nothing, has no jurisdiction whatsoever.

Representative ANGELL. Will there be submitted to the committee statistics with reference to the attendance in schools, of the children of the Territory, comparable on the mainland? [See exhibit No. 12.]

Mr. MAU. There should be, Mr. Chairman. I assume that the Territorial officials will take care of that.

Mr. SILVERMAN. Yes, the superintendent of public schools will appear, and the statistical material will be submitted, as will also the material in connection with public welfare.

Representative DELANEY. Mr. Mau, from the great bulk of evidence this committee heard, we are led to believe there are no racial discriminations existing on the islands. Do you subscribe to that theory?

Mr. MAU. That is quite broad, Mr. Delaney. I would say that, if you speak of it socially or it depends on whether you speak of it politically. Politically, I would say, "no"; socially, there might be some, which is inevitable. A man doesn't take a man into his house unless he feels that he's a type of man he wants to associate with. So, naturally, there is a certain amount of social discrimination.

Representative DELANEY. Politically, there is none?

Mr. MAU. Politically, there is none, as far as I know.

Representative DELANEY. Is there any discrimination against the mainland?

Mr. MAU. In recent years, politically?

Representative DELANEY. Yes.

Mr. MAU. There were two resolutions introduced at the board recently. The first with relation to members of the armed forces who might be discharged here. There was a fear on the part of the sponsor of that motion that the dischargees were so numerous that economically we could not care for them. The rest of the members insisted upon a hearing, which was held, a public hearing held, and that first resolution relating to the armed forces asking the Governor to use his good offices to see that not too many of them are discharged here, was unanimously defeated. The second resolution is still on the floor of the board. It relates to the civilian war workers coming from the mainland.

Representative DELANEY. Well, now let's just take the veterans. Was it not proposed here that in order for a veteran who might, who seeks to establish a homestead on these islands, that he qualify by having 5 years of residence here?

Mr. MAU. I have not heard of that.

Representative DELANEY. You are not familiar with that?

Mr. MAU. No, sir.

Representative DELANEY. I say, was it proposed? I don't ask you whether or not that resolution was passed.

Mr. MAU. It was not proposed, so far as the city and county administration is concerned, and I don't know if it was even proposed by the Territorial agencies or officials.

Representative DELANEY. Yes. Well, now let's go to our professional men. Was it not proposed that in order to establish the right to practice medicine here, that a man be a resident for a certain number of years?

Mr. MAU. One year, I think the law requires.

Representative DELANEY. Are you familiar with the Henriques bill, H. B. 405?

Mr. MAU. I am not, sir.

Representative DELANEY. Does that, or have you heard that that requires 3 years' residence in order that a man may be eligible to practice medicine or surgery?

Mr. MAU. I am not familiar with it.

Representative DELANEY. What about dentists? How long a residence must they have before they are allowed to practice dentistry?

Mr. MAU. I am not sure of that.

Representative DELANEY. Isn't your opinion that the addition of doctors and surgeons and dentists would improve the welfare of these islands?

Mr. MAU. I most certainly do. But these proposed restrictions, or any restrictions that we now have on the law books, through the Territorial legislature, are similar to some of the restrictions in the mainland.

Representative DELANEY. What about a juror, how many years' residence in order to qualify as a juror?

Mr. MAU. I am not sure about the residence. I think only 1 year, at least he must be a citizen of the United States and resident here. I don't know the number of years.

Representative DELANEY. Was it not proposed at the last session of the legislature that a man be a resident of the Territory for at least 8 years before he can qualify for jury duty?

Mr. MAU. That is without my—I have no information on that.

Representative DELANEY. You have no knowledge? Well, now, you started to talk sometime ago about returning workers to the mainland. Will you explain or elaborate on that?

Mr. MAU. Yes, there is now a resolution introduced by the same sponsor of the first resolution, calling upon the Governor to use his good offices to see that some of the mainland workers be returned.

Representative DELANEY. You say some of them. Will you elaborate on that?

Mr. MAU. Well, the first text of the resolution, as first introduced, used the word "undesirable." Some of the members have objected to that and I understand there is a proposal to amend. That resolution calls upon the Governor to use his good offices to see whether or not the contractors who brought these workers down here, or the Army and the Navy, would provide transportation back to the mainland. I might say that in my opinion that resolution has a very slim chance of passing. It will be defeated like the other resolution.

Representative DELANEY. Who is to decide who is an undesirable in a case of that type?

Mr. MAU. That is one of the main objections to the original resolution.

Representative DELANEY. But then, from these bills and these resolutions, there is some feeling against the mainland?

Mr. MAU. I think those two resolutions were introduced, based upon an economic ground, the employment situation. Here we have limited resources. Mind you, I do not sponsor either one of those resolutions. And I will probably vote for this next one, vote against it, like I voted against the first, but I am sure the sponsor of the bill only had in mind the economic question, the unemployment question, and feeling that the resources of the Territory are not as large to care for a great influx of workers. One of my arguments against the first resolution and which I think I will repeat, on the second resolution, is that the influx is not so great that we cannot take care of it.

Representative DELANEY. Well, you have no oversupply of help at the present time, have you?

Mr. MAU. I understand it is not the type of employees; common laborers, is what we lack today.

Representative DELANEY. Well, then, men in the skilled trades would not come under that category? I am talking about electricians, plumbers, steamfitters, if you should have any, bricklayers and men of that type. Would you qualify them, or would you say they are the type intended to be shipped back to the mainland?

Mr. MAU. No, there was no classification of any kind. I would think that these tradesmen, skilled tradesmen, would be an asset to this community.

Representative DELANEY. Unquestionably they would.

Mr. MAU. I think so.

Representative DELANEY. And at the present time there exists a shortage of labor here in the islands, isn't that right? [See Exhibit No. 33.]

Mr. MAU. I have no personal knowledge of that, but I heard Mr. Newcomb, or Holcomb, or whatever his name is, the employment head, state that the lack is in the ordinary laboring class, the common laborer.

Representative DELANEY. Well, isn't that common knowledge and isn't it prevalent everywhere that men who seek to employ people have difficulty in obtaining men and women who wish to work? Isn't that a prevalent condition?

Mr. MAU. I don't think so, if I follow you straight.

Representative DELANEY. Well, I'll give you, cite an example. Our hotel up where we stay is closed on Sunday, the dining room is closed, and we inquired as to the reason, and were told that, due to the shortage of help, they had to close down on Sunday. Now I understand that many other places on the island are suffering from a shortage of help, isn't that your belief?

Mr. MAU. I imagine in certain types of businesses, certain types of occupations, that might be true.

Representative DELANEY. I noted very little masonry on the island, that is, brickwork. Isn't it because of a shortage of bricklayers, or a shortage of brick, that you failed to put up brick buildings?

Mr. MAU. I don't think that is true, Mr. Delaney. We don't have much brick construction here. I was on the mainland and lived in brick houses, but we have very, very few, if any, brick houses here.

Representative DELANEY. All right, Mr. Mau.

Representative MILLER. Are you afraid of bloc voting, or is there any evidence of so-called bloc voting, being a practical politician?

Mr. MAU. Sometimes I wish I were as practical as some of the gentlemen here on the committee.

Representative MILLER. I think you do pretty well.

Mr. MAU. No, I am not afraid of bloc voting. I don't think it exists. Certainly it does not exist to the extent that we should fear. Those who raise the question, I think their fears are unfounded. If there were such a thing, and I am sure that you gentlemen will have the figures on the registered votes, and some by population, if there is such a thing I would probably not hold office. The Chinese are a minority of the voting class. I think only about 7,000 registered voters. The last election, if I recall, I received about, close to 20 000 votes. The only kind of bloc voting I would agree to would be all of the Caucasians, all of the Hawaiians and all of the Japanese, and all of them voting en bloc for me.

Representative MILLER. I noticed that you are a Democrat, and my being a Democrat too, I'd subscribe to bloc voting for Democrats.

Mr. MAU. Yes, sir.

Representative MILLER. Just for the sake of the record, my colleague, Mr. Delaney, has brought out certain things. I'd like to make a statement in regard to this 3-year restrictive bill for the practice of medicine, or dentistry or some of the professions, including the legal profession. From time to time in the California Legislature, with which I had the privilege of serving, we had similar bills before us,

some of which got by, and they were generally sponsored and fostered by the medical profession or the legal profession or the professions themselves in order to try and shut the door and keep somebody out. And it is not peculiar to the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii in that respect.

Delegate FARRINGTON. Mr. Mau, I'd like to, for the record, ask you if it is not true that you are testifying as a representative of the government of the city and county of Honolulu?

Mr. MAU. Yes, sir; I made that known in my opening statement.

Delegate FARRINGTON. And the purpose of your testimony is to demonstrate that the people of the islands, so far as the city and county are concerned, are perfectly capable of managing their own affairs?

Mr. MAU. Absolutely.

Delegate FARRINGTON. And that you favor statehood for Hawaii now?

Mr. MAU. Personally?

Delegate FARRINGTON. Yes.

Mr. MAU. Yes, indeed.

Chairman TAYLOR. What would you say about the prestige generally of the United States among the people of the islands here?

Mr. MAU. Very, very high.

Chairman TAYLOR. Judge, have you any questions you wish to ask?

Mr. ROBERTSON. None.

Chairman TAYLOR. Judge, I understand there are some other proponents you wish to have brought before the committee and if it is the wish of the committee we will suspend with those witnesses at the present time and take on some of the other witnesses who seem to be opposed to statehood.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That's my understanding, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman TAYLOR. We'll recess for 5 minutes.

(A recess was taken at this time. The meeting reconvened at 11 a. m.)

AFTER RECESS

Chairman TAYLOR. The Chair recognizes the chairman of the committee, Mr. Larcade.

Representative LARCADE. Mr. Chairman, and ladies and gentlemen, in view of the numerous requests that the committee has received in connection with having meetings at night, due to the inability of many of the citizens to appear during the daytime, the committee has decided that it will have a night hearing on Tuesday next, beginning at 8 o'clock. All of those, either for or against, who have been unable to appear during the day sessions, are invited to appear at that time.

Chairman TAYLOR. Mr. Silverman, we'll hear from you.

Mr. SILVERMAN. Mr. Chairman, as was indicated before, the committee decided to hear several people who are opposed to statehood, before going on with the case in favor of statehood, and that will be resumed after the committee returns from its visit to the islands. Among those listed in opposition to statehood is also an individual called Hal Hanna. Whether he is opposed or not, I don't know, but the committee does want to hear from Hal Hanna this morning, and I do call on Mr. Hanna.

Chairman TAYLOR. Mr. Hanna.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Chairman, members of this statehood committee, I would like to take the opportunity of extending the aloha nui loa for myself and the people of the Territory of Hawaii. We are very happy to have you down here.

Chairman TAYLOR. Thank you, Mr. Hanna. Will you sit down.

Mr. HANNA. I was born in Indianapolis, Ind., 27 years ago. I spent most of my, not most of my life, but 18 years of my life in California. I went as far as the twelfth grade in high school. At that time I moved to the Territory of Hawaii. I have lived on Kauai 2½ years, the island of Hawaii a year and a half, the island of Maui 2½ years, and over here 3½ years or 4 years, so I feel that I know the conditions of the Territory fairly well, having lived on all the islands and having lived with all types of racial elements over here. As I stated, before, we are very happy to have you down here.

Representative ANGELL. May I ask what your occupation is?

Mr. HANNA. Yes, sir. I am a publisher.

Chairman TAYLOR. Do you hold any official position now?

Mr. HANNA. Yes, sir; I am a representative in our Territorial legislature.

Chairman TAYLOR. Is there anything else concerning your background you would care to submit for the record?

Mr. HANNA. Not unless there is something you would like to ask me.

Chairman TAYLOR. Proceed.

Mr. HANNA. As I say, we are very happy to have you down here. However, it would have been a fine thing if a statehood committee could have come down here unannounced, mixed in with the people on the various islands, felt the various trends of thought on statehood, and gotten a general opinion rather than holding a—such a formal hearing as a thing like this.

Chairman TAYLOR. Would you speak into the "mike," please. I think it's difficult for some of the people in the room to hear you.

Mr. HANNA. These booklets I put out, Big 5 Monopoly in Hawaii, and Land Monopoly in Hawaii, I put out after the last legislature.

I had sponsored some liberal, progressive measures, and I got nowhere in the legislature. I was told I was too outspoken by various people here. Many of these reforms must come to pass in Hawaii if we are going to have statehood. After I published these booklets, I tried to get them on all the, in and on all the legitimate book stores and magazine stands, so that the people of Hawaii could actually find out what is going on, the general economic background, and so forth, of the islands. I went to Liberty House. They refused to handle them. They are owned by one of the Big Five. I went to Wall-Nichols. They said they were owned by the Big Five, and couldn't possibly handle them. I went to Pattons, another large book store over here. They refused to handle it. I took it to the outside islands. I couldn't get it handled in any of the stores at all. Finally Mr. Stewart of the Stewart's Pharmacies up here said, "Well, if no one else will handle it, I will handle it. I think this is the type of thing the people of the Territory should read." So Mr. Stewart handled the booklet. We have been getting it out.

Now I asked these people why they wouldn't handle my booklet. They tell me, "Hal, we are all for you. We are for your social and

economic reforms in the community. However, we have to do business with the big interests over here, and we don't want to antagonize them." Now, that is prevalent and very inherent among the people over here. Why it is, I don't know. But ever since I have been in the Territory there has been an inherent fear of the Big Five over here. I have compiled a history of the Territory for many years and an exposé history, which I think I will submit to this committee later, and possibly through that you can get the clear picture of this fear that the people have.

If I may, I would like to go into this booklet on land monopoly now. Do you gentlemen have it in front of you? I'd like to remark on it. [Exhibit No. 47.]

Maury Maverick, who has just passed through here, many of you gentleman know in his book, *In Blood and Ink*, had the following to say:

Ownership of the land, or property rights in it, is the basis of all liberties. Land is wealth; wealth is power; power is liberty. In the last analysis, the liberty of the people (or an individual) depends upon the quantity and quality of the land they possess. Democracy to me is liberty plus economic security.

However, the people of the Territory of Hawaii own only 8.7 percent of the land. By "people" I am referring to the masses of people over here.

In his message to Congress our present Governor, Ingram M. Stainback, spoke on land monopoly over here. He advocated measures, legislation, to combat this. I introduced it and sponsored the bill in the house of representatives. It went to the judiciary committee, and there it died a very horrible death. I didn't have a possible chance with it. If I can find it here, I would like to say something that was given on it. The following statements are made during a judiciary meeting, judiciary committee meeting, in Iolani Palace by Representatives Hiram Fong and Porteus. Referring to house bill 475, homes authority bill:

There is no definite need of opening up lands now. It would be impossible to build now anyway. House bill 475 will be killed in the senate, so why pass it in the house? The judiciary committee should not take the responsibility of passing this type of bill. Not effective, the people are just worrying about war housing. Nothing so radical on land in the last 900 years. Radical departure of convention.

Gentlemen, I ask you, people are not interested in convention right now. People in the Territory of Hawaii are looking for home sites, and they are looking for home sites that they can buy at a decent price. There are plenty of lands available in the Territory that we don't need to take away from agriculture. There are many lands on all the islands, lying idle. They are either owned outright by various plantations and corporations, or they are leased from the Territorial government, and they lie vacant there.

You take, for instance, the seaport town of Kahului, Maui, the little township of Lihue, Kauai, and various other spots on the islands that you gentlemen will no doubt visit. You can't possibly get in there with a crowbar. It's impossible to buy a piece of land to go into business at all.

Now I heard in previous testimony that it was easy to get land on the other islands. It isn't. I wrote Mr. F. F. Baldwin, who is one of the heads of the Hawaiian Commercial & Sugar Co., a letter dur-

ing the legislature, and I asked Mr. Baldwin if he didn't think it advisable, since the people of Maui were very interested in acquiring home sites for possible war building, if he didn't think it possible to open up lands on the main highway between Kahului and Wailuku in Maui. I received a letter from Mr. Baldwin that there were two or three lots left on the island that were still available. Until they were sold he didn't feel they would open any more lands. Those two or three lots that were available were not what people wanted, and so it didn't make any effect on Mr. Baldwin at all.

If you will bear with me just a moment—as I say, I introduced this measure for Governor Stainback, and we got nowhere with it. The ownership of land, the areas in acres of all lands in the Territory of Hawaii by approximate ownership and the utilization, and these are recent figures: Federal agencies, 1,000, I mean 199,709 acres—

Chairman TAYLOR. Excuse me, what page are you reading from?

Mr. HANNA. There is no page in this booklet, Congressman. It's the first white page. The United States Army at this time held 24,770 acres; the United States Navy, 12,284; national parks, 162,047, and others 608, coming to 199,709 acres. Of these 41,000 are agricultural lands; sugarcane leases, 30,000; pineapple leases, 3,070; other agricultural, 8,000. We can go on through this. It would take too long. However, on this island, for instance, I would like to name the 28 largest landowners, and show that they own a percentage of 65 percent of all the land on this island. They are:

The Bishop estate, the Campbell estate, the Waialua Agricultural Co., the John Ii estate, Ltd., the Castle estate, the McCandless estate, the Waianae Co., Zions Securities Corp., the Damon estate, the Robinson estate, the M. P. Robinson estate, the Mary E. Foster estate, Kualoa Ranch, Ltd., the Austin estate, the Mendonca trust estate, the George Galbraith trust estate, the Kahaluu land trust, Robert Hind, Ltd., Hawaiian Avocado Co., Oahu Railway & Land Co., Mokuleia Ranch & Land Co., trustees of Emma Kaleleonalani estate, Roman Catholic Church, Sing Chong Co., Hawaiian Pineapple Co., Ltd., Charlottee H. L. Cassidy et al., Hawaiian Land & Improvement Co., Ltd., Charles W. Lucas trust, and the Wahiawa Water Co.

Those 28, with a land area of 249,000 acres, own 65 percent of all the land on this island. All the other private owners own 40,000. Public lands, vacant and leased, are 15,000 acres. Public lands department, 33,000 acres; Hawaiian Homes Commission, 941 acres; and the city and county, 735 acres. The grand total is 386,000 acres on this island.

As we go to the other islands you will see where the Houston estate owns 76 percent of Oahu—pardon me, I am going to the island of Hawaii here—on the island of Hawaii, the Campbell estate has 25,999.2 acres, or 1.01 percent. The Bishop estate owns 11.35 percent of that island. The Parker ranch, 13 percent; Shipman ranch, 2.88 percent; Kohala Sugar Co., 0.57 percent, and on down, giving a total land area of 2,579,200 acres.

The island of Molokai, the Molokai ranch, owned by Mr. George P. Cook, has 69,000 acres, or 41.88 percent of the whole island. Mr. Fagan's ranch comes next, at 8.33 percent. The largest percentages from there on are the Hawaiian Homes Commission, the Territorial department. All others, the people own 9.70 percent.

The island of Lanai is owned completely by the Hawaiian Pineapple Co., all but possibly a fraction of a percent.

The island of Kauai is owned, as you can see, by the Bishop estate, 3.02 percent; Rice Ltd., 1.16 percent; the McBryde Sugar Co., 3.44 percent; the Lihue Plantation Co., which is the biggest sugar plantation in the island, 12.26 percent, and on down, all others, the people, 11.04 percent.

The island of Niihau is owned exclusively by the Robinson family. I believe it was purchased for \$10,000. The public is not allowed to appear on that island. If you went over there, possibly the committee could get on it. A civilian of this, or an American citizen, could not get on it. They feel it is personal property. They keep all outsiders out. I'll bring that up a little later. I am just trying to give you a picture of the land situation in the Territory.

I introduced a resolution in the last legislature. It went to the land committee of the house of representatives here. I failed to get any action on it, so I had the printing committee, of which I was assistant chairman there, print 600 and had them sent to the National Congress. I don't know whether you gentleman received them or not.

I would like to go into the land leases here in the Territory. I may ask, why did the former Territorial land commissioners literally give thousands of acres of Hawaii's land leases to the big interests of the Territory for a mere song? Today in Hawaii people are finding it almost impossible to purchase land under any condition. Did you know that the big land leases of Hawaii pay an average yearly land rental of \$0.27 per acre per year for pastoral land?

Representative MILLER. What type of land?

Mr. HANNA. Pastoral land. Yet the people over here in the Territory that could use some of this same land for home sites go begging. They can't purchase home sites at a decent price, and it's outrageous. The big land leasers in Hawaii pay an average yearly rental of \$7 or \$8 in the Territory, that the sugar and pineapple industry are leasing from the Territory, which is a very decidedly small amount. The Territory realize only \$139,000 a year from leases on pastoral lands. Realizations from leases on sugar and cane and pineapple lands are \$290,000 a year, and these are our two biggest industries, cane and sugar. Yet when more money is needed through taxation, what happens? The little fellow pays again. And the total revenue to the Territory of Hawaii for all land leases for a year is only \$1,247,000, which is absurd for the land that is being leased.

Now we turn over here to this graph here. I have just listed some of these various ranches and sugar companies, and so forth, that are leasing land, and it will show you at what figure per acre a year they are leasing land for. I realize all of this land isn't top quality land, but there should be a minimum set in the Territory when we have so little land for Territorial leases.

You take here in various ranches, for instance, the Shipman, Ltd., in Puna, 13½ cents per year per acre; Richard Smart Ranch, 59 cents an acre; the Harold Rice Ranch, 27 cents an acre. It goes on down like this, through all these Territorial leases.

Now it's understood by myself and all the other people in the Territory who have been trying to find a home site; I know I have, I have been out to Kanohe. I moved over here recently from Maui.

I wanted to buy a little place out in Kanohe, and I find it impossible to buy a place unless I want to pay \$8,000 or \$10,000 for a lot out there. That is unreasonable, because Harold Castle out there has 14,000 acres of beautiful land out there that would be wonderful for home sites, for farms, all this type of thing that is being used for pastoral lands. The Territory doesn't receive the money it should from this type of land. That's prevalent all over the Territory.

There are only three ways we can open up lands in the Territory of Hawaii. Either these large landholders do it of their own accord and free will, or we should pass legislation condemning the property and paying a fair market value, or possibly through statehood the Congress of the United States, the laws of the United States, would affect the Territory of Hawaii. The last reason is this: If these properties were properly assessed at their present market value, these people, these large landowners, would have to sell or they would have to pay the right taxes on them. Today they are not doing that. This is an unbalanced situation and it isn't due to the fact that the people don't have money. Lands are just not available for purchase.

What I would like to see done is a new tax structure on land in the Territory of Hawaii, assessing property at its present market value instead of this 4-year term we have over here—for what it's actually worth. In this 4-year term, if your tax commissioner goes out to a plantation and makes an assessment and they don't particularly like it, they start legal action over it, and it takes years to get anything done about it, and then the Territory still probably doesn't get the tax assessment that they asked for.

Representative ANGELL. Isn't that changed to 1 year now?

Mr. HANNA. I don't really know, I doubt it.

Representative ANGELL. It was testified here yesterday by the tax commissioner that it was, I believe.

Mr. HANNA. I'm sorry, I could be wrong on that. Also, if it has, these lands should be immediately reassessed and these people, these large landowners, could get, at the present market values, a wonderful price for their land. No one is asking them to give it away. Most people have money to buy lands for home sites. This is one of the points I wanted to bring up.

I put out these booklets. I thought they would be interesting to the people of the Territory, showing the picture of the land, and I submit it to you gentlemen for your consideration.

Chairman TAYLOR. Did you want to include it in the record, Mr. Hanna?

Mr. HANNA. Yes, sir; I have submitted it to—

Chairman TAYLOR. Is there any objection to that, gentlemen?

Representative DELANEY. Only this, that the record is going to be of tremendous size, it would take two porters to carry the record, if you are going to include everything. We have already accepted a great deal from other witnesses who have been sworn. I have no objection.

Representative LARCADE. Mr. Chairman, I think in view of the fact that this particular document contains considerable statistical data that it would be proper to include this document, but not the smaller one, because that has to do—

Chairman TAYLOR. Well, Mr. Hanna is only offering, as I understand it, this one land document. If there is no objection, we will receive it.

(The document, entitled, "Land Monopoly in Hawaii," compiled by Representative Hal Hanna, was received as exhibit No. 47.)

Mr. HANNA. May I go on?

Chairman TAYLOR. If you please.

Mr. HANNA. Turning to the other book, Big 5 Monopoly in Hawaii [See exhibit No. 48] many people have different interpretations of what the Big Five is. We hear that the five families or the five this or the five that. Actually, the Big Five, as it is thought of in the Territory, means the five largest factors, sugar and pineapple factors. I'll read those to you—so you will—if you will bear with me just a moment. These five factors—

Chairman TAYLOR. What page, please?

Mr. HANNA. Thirty-six. These five factors are: American Factors, Castle & Cooke, Alexander & Baldwin, C. Brewer & Co., Theo. H. Davies. These are thought of in the Territory as the Big Five, also their subsidiary companies and holdings. I would like to quote a few passages here from a person by the name of Henry Rudin, former recreational director of Waialua plantation:

Hawaii is by no means ready to join the sisterhood of States, due to the unhealthy state of control of her economic set-up, legislature, police, and judiciary.

The following is by Ray Stannard Baker, of the American magazine:

Rarely have I visited a place where there is so much charity and so little democracy as in Hawaii.

From Richard A. Cooke, annual HSPA meeting, 1929:

As has been emphasized again and again, the primary function of our plantations is not to produce sugar but to pay dividends.

Up to now the Asiatic has had only an economic value in the social equation. So far as the institutions, laws, customs, and language of the permanent population go, his presence is no more felt than is that of the cattle on the ranges.

This is made by Royal Mead, HSPA secretary, in the Sugar Industry and Hawaii, 1910.

I personally, on racial intolerance, feel that no man should hold another man in contempt for the accident of his birth. Next to a man's ego his racial intolerance is his worst fault.

By Richard A. Cooke, HSPA president, 1930:

I can see little difference between the importation of foreign laborers and the importation of jute bags from India.

Yet we have had a hullabaloo here in the Territory about bringing in 6,000 more Filipino people. Yet it shows here by Mr. Cooke, his attitude, that they mean nothing over here, no more than jute bags. I wonder what he means by that? Is it that they hold the people of the islands in contempt? People that are not Caucasians?

Now we come to this interlocking directorate. If you will turn to page 15, a chart has been compiled by the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics. If you gentlemen will look at this, this is one of the Big Five corporations here in the Territory, you may get an idea of the interlocking directorship of one of these agencies. It would

be very interesting to show all five of them on a chart. The lines, gentlemen, would be completely black. There wouldn't be any lines in it. It would be very interesting, I think, while you gentlemen are here, that I might suggest that you look into that and have someone draw up a chart, if you are particularly interested in that phase of it.

Now we go to water ownership.

Representative DELANEY. While you are on that, I so request that you have such a chart submitted and made part of this record.

Mr. HANNA. All right, sir.

Representative DELANEY. Showing the interlocking of directors in these sugar companies.

Chairman TAYLOR. And you will prepare that chart, will you, Mr. Hanna?

Mr. HANNA. Well, I'll do part of it, and have someone help me. We'll take water ownership, for instance. You take on the outside islands, like Hawaii, Maui, and Kauai, for instance, I have just moved over from Maui. The people of Maui have to buy their water from the big corporations over there. The corporations many years ago were able, by one way or the other, to acquire either Territorial leases or buy the origination of this water outright, and the people must buy their water from the plantations. That is not a healthy condition. The public should own their own water supply. They should not have to buy it from anyone. The county of Maui, the county of Kauai, the county of Hawaii, and some of the various districts here on this island should own their own water rights; the public, not private corporations. And as you gentlemen travel on the various islands you may look into that and find, and get a little more information on it.

Chairman TAYLOR. We intend to see it all, Mr. Hanna.

Mr. HANNA. You take shipping, for instance. The Matson Line has had a monopoly down here for many years, as you probably know. The President Line at one time was giving them some competition, in fact they were giving them so much competition that they brought the President Line to their knees by charging a 50-cent rebate on the dollar. The Maritime Commission finally stopped that. [See statement No. 22.] However, the Matson company still has the monopoly on shipping down here. Eighty-five percent of all our products, everything we eat and use in the Territory of Hawaii, comes in on ships. Now the boats go over loaded with sugar and pineapples. They come back loaded with merchandise. There has been an attempt by the various interests over here to curtail small farming, and as you travel around the island if you will talk to the small farmer you will find this out for yourselves. Why? Because, if there is enough small farming over here that takes away a lot of shipping that would come in on the Matson Line. There has been a decided—during the war even, the Territory of Hawaii was not self-subsistent. It never has been as far as agriculture is concerned, other than the two or three main products over here, and that is because agriculture has been kept down.

During the war, if you will turn to this article over here by John P. Frank, I don't exactly know whether he was with the Interior Department or not, his article appeared in the Columbia Law Review

of September 1944. I wired to Dean Young Smith of the Columbia Law School, and I got permission to use this article that had appeared in the Columbia Law Review. In it it will show that—may I read this? [Reading:]

One of the military's experiments was its attempt to encourage food production. Due to shipping shortages, the Territory has a basic problem in wartime in supplying itself with food, particularly vegetables normally brought from the mainland. One method of increasing vegetable production would be to cut down on pineapple and sugar acreage, using these lands for more immediate purposes. General Emmons appointed as director of food production Walter F. Dillingham, member of one of the Big Five families. One of the first decisions of the new food director was to oppose all efforts to take land from the pineapple and sugar industries for food production.

So you see, we were not ready for the war as far as food, and the reason indicates that small farming has been kept down over here.

Many people wonder why homes over here cost so much money. Right now is an abnormal time here in Hawaii as it is on the mainland. No comparison can be made now. However, in Hawaii the prices on homes and building materials were abnormal even during normal times. For instance, a load of lumber coming down here was exorbitant compared to what you could buy it for on the mainland. Pardon me just a moment, I'll browse through this [referring to booklet]. I can't find it at the present time. I'll come to it later.

I'd like to take up also the utilities companies. During the legislature I introduced a bill changing it, asking that the 5 percent on utilities companies be raised to 7½ percent, so we could get more revenue for the Territory. This bill went to the finance committee, and it died a very natural death. I went to the utilities commission and I asked that a summary of the various utility companies in the Territory be made for me, and records for the last 4 years made on earnings, on their net allowables, their scale, and so forth, what they were incorporated for. Many utility companies here in the Territory have been getting away with murder, especially during the last 4 years.

As an example, I cite the Honolulu Rapid Transit Co., which has milked the public of over a million and a half dollars in the last 3 or 4 years. Their net allowables are set by the utilities commission. They have depreciation funds to take care of their busses as they depreciate. I introduced a resolution asking their committee on the house to meet with the utilities commission to ascertain whether we couldn't have a 5-cent bus ride here in Hawaii on the Honolulu Rapid Transit. I was told that it wouldn't get in the papers, and it didn't get in the papers. I thought it was very interesting to most people here on this island, because many of them use the busses daily. However, that was killed.

You take these various water companies, traction companies, and so forth. May I suggest that the committee ask for a detailed report on these various utility companies in the Territory for the last 25 years, both as to what figure they began at, what their percentage of profits has been, their net allowables and what percentage over the net allowables they have been making.

Now you take the Waiahi Electric Co., a subsidiary of the Lilihue Plantation Co., made 43 percent above their net allowables last year, 43 percent above. The Honolulu Rapid Transit made 4.5 percent above their net allowables. That doesn't sound like much, but when

you are allowed 7 or 8 percent and you make almost 100 percent more, why should the public pay for that?

I understand that the Inter-Island Steam Navigation Co. now is asking the Maritime Commission for a 50-percent increase in freight rates between the islands. We already have one of the most terrific freight rates in the world. Why should the public of the Territory of Hawaii pay for these new ships that the Inter-Island wants to build and bring over here? They have a depreciation fund for this type of thing. I really feel that the public utilities over here, and these various shipping companies, and the traction companies, I believe the whole thing should be looked into.

The Republican Party and the vested interests here in the Territory—the Republican Party has always been the leading party here in the Territory. In fact, we only have a one-party system, that is the Republican Party. You have two or three Democrats that have the intestinal fortitude to oppose them, but you have never had enough liberals to get control of the legislature. There are many fine Democrats among the people. There are many fine Republicans among the people. But the Republican Party here in the Territory is not the same as the Republican Party on the mainland. Neither is their integrity. It's a known fact here in the Territory that during the last 47 years, since this has been a Territory, that the Republican Party is a party of the big interests. If you took time to check on all the legislators, delegates, county officials, among all these people on the islands, you would find a terrific percentage of Republicans. Why? Because Democrats, the word "Democrat" over here for many years was nothing. People were afraid to be Democrats. It was in direct opposition to the vested interests here. They had control. What could the people do? They relied on the interests here for their bread, water, place to lay their head at night, and so forth. So there is not much opposition that they could give the Republican Party.

I'm very happy to say that it's a good thing for Hawaii that we have a Governor like Ingram M. Stainback over here representing the Federal Government. It's good to have a liberal-minded person over here. I think Mr. Stainback is one of the finest governors the Territory ever had.

In summation, I would like to say that all of us people here are living in a decidedly new era. Labor, the labor movement, has come to the fore here in the Territory. It has been a salvation of most of the people on the plantations. And the sooner that the vested interests of the Territory get rid of the idea of only making money and take their place in the social and economic order over here, whereby they work cooperatively with the people rather than only looking at the money end of it, insuring a man the fundamental things of life so he can feel respectable in the community, the sooner labor and the vested interests over here are going to get together and come to an amiable agreement with both. That can be done in the Territory. I'm not against the capitalistic system here. I am not against the big interests for themselves. I am only against some of the intimidations, the coercions that they pull over here. I am interested in breaking up, not breaking up, but opening up lands for home sites, and I think the sooner that all of us realize that and get together, Hawaii will be a finer place to live in, and I would like to say at this time that I am

definitely for statehood, which was misquoted in the morning paper. However, I would like to see some of these reforms come through. I'd like to see Hawaii clean up her own back yard first before we get statehood. However, I am for statehood 100 percent.

Chairman TAYLOR. We'll suspend for 2 minutes, shall we say, to give the stenographer an opportunity to revive.

(A recess was taken at this point. The meeting reconvened at 11:45 o'clock, a. m.)

AFTER RECESS

Chairman TAYLOR. Gentlemen of the committee, are there any questions you would like to ask?

Representative LARCADE. I would.

Representative ANGELL. Before you do that, I'd like to ask permission that this booklet, entitled "Big Five Monopoly in Hawaii," be submitted as an exhibit, but not included in the record, owing to its length.

Chairman TAYLOR. Any objections? If none, we will receive it, with that provision.

(The booklet was received and entered as Exhibit No. 48.)

Representative LARCADE. Mr. Hanna, you stated in your testimony there was generally an inherent fear of the "Big Five" by the people of this Territory. I would like to ask you, do you know of any persons who have opposed the "Big Five," where they have retaliated against them in any way?

Mr. HANNA. Congressman Larcade, there are many things in this world that we know exist. We can't always get people up to prove them. However, that doesn't make them untrue. For instance, when I got out these booklets, the general pattern of people's ideas on this, for instance, people look at me and say, "Did you compile this," and I say, "Yes, I compiled it." "Well, aren't you afraid of the big interests over here?" "No, why should I be?" Well, some day you will be floating down the Ala Wai, or they will ship you out of the Territory." I mean, that's the general pattern that any person over here who will remark when they see a thing like this, or when they see somebody here in the Territory give opposition to the vested interests here. I would like to have brought quite a number of people up here. However, at a formal meeting like this, and with the conditions existing in the Territory, people won't come up. I can refer to Mr. Silverman on that. I think he has tried to get more opposition, and there is a decided opposition to statehood. Very few people are appearing, very few people will appear. They are not in a position to appear. They feel that their security is involved. And they just refused.

Representative LARCADE. Would you have any specific instances of retaliation or prosecution or persecution of any individual or citizen of the islands by the so-called vested interests?

Mr. HANNA. Not that I can bring up in front of the committee; no, sir. They refuse to appear.

Representative ANGELL. I believe you stated, however, you are not opposed to statehood?

Mr. HANNA. No; I am for statehood, sir, and I would like to see some of these reforms put through. If statehood is going to help this issue, it's wonderful, I am for statehood 100 percent.

Representative ANGELL. Do you not feel that under statehood these reforms might be accomplished perhaps more easily than under the Territorial form of government?

Mr. HANNA. You mean we could accomplish the reforms?

Representative ANGELL. Yes.

Mr. HANNA. I think so; yes, sir.

Representative ANGELL. So what you are saying are arguments in favor of statehood rather than against it?

Mr. HANNA. I am not against statehood, I am for it.

Representative ANGELL. So these other people you have mentioned who are reticent and hesitate to testify, they too would perhaps be in favor of statehood?

Mr. HANNA. Sir, I would say that almost all people in the Territory are really for statehood. When you ask them that, they don't bring up the statehood issue. They will bring up some company doing this, or some corporation pulling that. It's that type of thing. It isn't that they are actually against statehood. I believe that the people in the Territory are for statehood, almost 100 percent. However, I think with a party such as yours coming down here with a liberal mind, who will listen to all of us and evaluate it for what it's worth, I think it's the finest thing that could happen to the Territory.

Representative ANGELL. So these maladministrations to which you have referred have little bearing on the question of whether Hawaii should be admitted to statehood or not?

Mr. HANNA. Well, they have a bearing on it, sir, because I think statehood will accomplish quite a bit on this reform angle.

Representative ANGELL. Then, in other words, they are favorable to statehood rather than in opposition to it?

Mr. HANNA. I don't quite understand you, sir.

Representative ANGELL. Well, these maladministrations to which you have referred here on the island, with reference to land ownership and monopoly and all that sort of thing, under your view, I believe, might be corrected more easily under statehood than under the Territorial form of government?

Mr. HANNA. Yes, sir; I believe so, sir.

Representative ANGELL. So that those maladministrations are in favor of statehood rather than against it?

Mr. HANNA. If you put it with your first statement; yes, sir.

Representative DELANEY. Mr. Hanna, it was my impression that this time was to be reserved for those who are opposed to statehood. You stated that you are for statehood, is that immediate statehood or a deferred statehood?

Mr. HANNA. I am for statehood—well, some of these reforms could be cleaned up by our own government down here. However—

Representative DELANEY. I asked you a simple question. Are you for statehood immediately or deferred statehood?

Mr. HANNA. At the present time I am for statehood immediately.

Representative DELANEY. Now, can you explain to this committee why it was that you weren't included with the proponents of statehood?

Mr. HANNA. I couldn't answer that question.

Representative DELANEY. Did you make a request to Judge Robertson to be heard as a proponent?

Mr. HANNA. No, sir.

Representative DELANEY. Is there any explanation of your appearance here at this time when this particular period of time was to be reserved for the opponents?

Mr. HANNA. I was asked by Mr. Silverman yesterday to appear. I didn't ask him to appear.

Representative DELANEY. Now, I have received copies, and I am very much interested in these two books that appeared on my desk earlier in the week. The first one reads, "Big Five Monopoly in Hawaii." Is it your belief that there is such a thing as a "Big Five" monopoly?

Mr. HANNA. There is an entity that is called the "Big Five," which is an interlocking directorship here among the large corporations.

Representative DELANEY. Well, size alone doesn't create a monopoly, is that right; is that your impression?

Mr. HANNA. Size alone; no, sir.

Representative DELANEY. Size has nothing to do with the monopoly?

Mr. HANNA. It's not the size, it is the integration of business and utility companies and wholesale and retail stores, and most anything that you can lay your hand on in Hawaii is tied up with these five large companies, through their directors, through presidents of various corporations holding directorships in others, and, as I say, when I present this, compile this new chart for you, you will probably get a more complete picture.

Representative DELANEY. Yes; a monopoly exists, does it not, when it destroys free enterprise?

Mr. HANNA. That's one way of putting it; yes, sir.

Representative DELANEY. Now, before we go on, I'm very much interested in this book—you said you published the book. In publishing this book did you represent any group?

Mr. HANNA. Well, I'll tell you, Congressman, as I said, I tried to get some reforms in the legislature, and, to put it very crudely, the boys wanted to give me the business.

Representative DELANEY. No; I am not interested in that.

Mr. HANNA. So I decided I would put them out on my own. I spent \$5,000.

Representative DELANEY. That's exactly what I wanted to know. Did you receive contributions from anyone to help you circulate these books?

Mr. HANNA. I did, 3 days ago, from two people.

Representative DELANEY. Well, prior to that, you circulated these books on your own; is that right?

Mr. HANNA. Yes, sir; but I couldn't get them sold in the Territory.

Representative DELANEY. Wait a second; we'll get to that. And you invested your funds in the publication of these books; is that right?

Mr. HANNA. Yes, sir.

Representative DELANEY. And you did it because you felt that it would serve this community?

Mr. HANNA. I am a man of integrity, sir; that's the reason.

Representative DELANEY. You felt that it would render some good as a result of the circulation of these books?

Mr. HANNA. That's right, sir.

Representative DELANEY. Now, I feel that a serious charge has been made here about restriction of free press. Where did you have these books printed?

Mr. HANNA. Well, I took them to two print shops, and after going over the material they refused to print it. I have a letter in my files from the Midpacifican Press and the gentleman that owns the firm, through his attorney, Katsuro Miho, here in the Territory, sent me a letter and said, "After reading the contents of this book, I am sorry we cannot publish your booklet."

Representative DELANEY. Have you such a letter?

Mr. HANNA. I believe it's in my files; yes, sir.

Representative DELANEY. I ask that it be made a part of this record. Will you submit it?

Mr. HANNA. All right, sir.

Chairman TAYLOR. Any objection to that letter being included in the record, gentlemen?

(No response.)

Representative DELANEY. These men are in publication and printing as part of their business?

Mr. HANNA. Yes, sir.

Representative DELANEY. Who else did you go to in order to have these books and material published?

Mr. HANNA. Well, I finally—I tried the Maui Publishing Co., on Maui, and I tried to do it in my own print shop.

Representative DELANEY. Did you meet with any success with this other publisher?

Mr. HANNA. No, sir.

Representative DELANEY. How many publishers on these islands did you go to have these booklets printed?

Mr. HANNA. After talking to three or four, and I found out what the indication was, there was no point in going from door to door asking them to print it. The general trend was they didn't want to print it. However, I finally got one printer in the Territory to print it.

Representative DELANEY. Yes?

Mr. HANNA. In Honolulu, here. And he didn't want to print it. However, he was gracious enough to do it for me. He read the contents of it, and he thought it was good and the public should know this type of thing, and he did the job for me.

Representative DELANEY. Yes. And these books; were both of them printed at your own expense, your own personal expense?

Mr. HANNA. Yes, sir; I paid \$2,500 for each book.

Representative DELANEY. I note that there is no sales price on these books. At what price were they offered for sale?

Mr. HANNA. Originally they were offered for a dollar.

Representative DELANEY. But no price appears on the cover of the book?

Mr. HANNA. No, sir.

Representative DELANEY. Now, you say you attempted to sell these books to various distributors?

Mr. HANNA. Yes, sir.

Representative DELANEY. They had no objection to accepting books for sale?

Mr. HANNA. That was their business.

Representative DELANEY. And did you offer them the usual percentage?

Mr. HANNA. Wholesale price.

Representative DELANEY. Of profit?

Mr. HANNA. Yes, sir; in fact, better than average.

Representative DELANEY. Gave them a better than average?

Mr. HANNA. So I could get good distribution in the Territory.

Representative DELANEY. When you first approached them, were they in an acceptable mood to sell books?

Mr. HANNA. The reaction was, they looked at it and smiled very politely and said, "We cannot handle this type of thing, we do business with the big interests." If you want names, I'll give you the names.

Representative DELANEY. Is it your opinion at the present time that the distribution of printed material is curtailed?

Mr. HANNA. I don't quite get your question.

Representative DELANEY. Well, I'll try and clear it up. Would you say that there are in these islands distributors of printed material who refused to offer your book for sale because of the material contained therein?

Mr. HANNA. Yes, sir. One company I went to distributes to over 200 newsstands and book stores over here. This gentleman took the books around to Benson-Smith Drugs, for instance, who has a chain over here. He took it to various other newsstands, and when I went back to talk over the situation with him, he said, "I'm very sorry, Hal. We can't do anything for you. They won't accept the book on the stands."

Representative DELANEY. Is there a chain distributor in the Territory?

Mr. HANNA. There are two.

Representative DELANEY. What are the names?

Mr. HANNA. Wall-Nichols and Paradise News Service, Agency.

Representative DELANEY. And it's their business to distribute all printed material, periodicals, and newspapers?

Mr. HANNA. Yes, sir.

Representative DELANEY. Do they maintain trucks and agencies for such distribution?

Mr. HANNA. Yes, sir.

Representative DELANEY. And you offered your book to each of these?

Mr. HANNA. Each of them.

Representative DELANEY. You say you were finally successful—withdraw that for the moment. Do you know who the directors of these agencies are?

Mr. HANNA. No; I don't, sir.

Representative DELANEY. You say you were finally successful in having one man to handle your book, in that right?

Mr. HANNA. Yes, sir; Mr. Stewart of Stewart's Pharmacies here in Honolulu.

Representative DELANEY. How many books were sold?

Mr. HANNA. I haven't taken count of it recently. We have sold several thousand of them.

Representative DELANEY. Several thousand, would you say?

Mr. HANNA. Yes, sir.

Representative DELANEY. Well, since this committee started its hearings has there been a request for this material?

Mr. HANNA. Yes, sir; they have gone to the Governor's office, people, citizens, they have gone all over the building here. I gave 1,500 of the books out so far. Some one gave me a contribution to help me get the books out to the public that attended the statehood hearing. However, that doesn't even cover the printing price. However, now is the time for this to do some good in the community. Now is the time to distribute them.

Representative DELANEY. Now, I was very much interested in your definite statement that a monopoly exists in shipping here on the islands. By what authority do you make that statement?

Mr. HANNA. Well, there is only one steamship company that is bringing all of the merchandise into the Territory. They had competition at one time, as I explained. However, the President Lines have started calling in here.

Representative DELANEY. All right. Now, when the President Line ran in here for some time was there a reduction in the rates of the Matson Line?

Mr. HANNA. I couldn't say, sir. I don't know. I couldn't say.

Representative DELANEY. Couldn't say?

Representative DELANEY. Well, let's explain that 50-percent rebate, though, was because the President Lines were going to bring people over here and take them back at a cheaper rate.

Representative DELANEY. Well, let's explain that 50-cent rebate. Will you explain that to the committee?

Mr. HANNA. Yes, sir. I'll read this: "Only one shipping company has control of all shipping between Hawaii and the mainland. This is the Matson Navigation Co., largely owned and completely controlled by the Big Five. When the Dollar Line started calling at Hawaii's ports, the Matson Co. put two ships into trans-Pacific service and by undercutting rates, brought the Dollar Line [see Statement No. 22] to her knees."

Representative DELANEY. By undercutting rates, will you explain undercutting rates?

Mr. HANNA. I understood it to be that they undercut their rates so they could get business between here and the mainland.

Representative DELANEY. Well, do you know as a fact that rates were cut?

Mr. HANNA. I don't.

Representative DELANEY. Are there rebates, or that rebates were offered?

Mr. HANNA. I know from the Maritime Commission.

Representative DELANEY. No, wait. I asked you a simple question. Do you know of your own knowledge?

Mr. HANNA. No, sir.

Representative DELANEY. What effort have you made to inquire into the phase of whether rates were cut by the Matson Lines?

Mr. HANNA. Well, I have written to the Maritime Commission.

Representative DELANEY. Will you explain what happened?

Mr. HANNA. Well, nothing has happened so far.

Representative DELANEY. When did you write?

Mr. HANNA. Oh, right after the legislature. I got the names and addresses of various Congressmen and found the Maritime Commission in there, and wrote a letter to them.

Representative DELANEY. Well, now, after some period of time the President Line discontinued, is that right?

Mr. HANNA. Yes, sir.

Representative DELANEY. Do you know whether there was any increase of rates in the Matson Line?

Mr. HANNA. I don't know.

Representative DELANEY. Do you know whether they discontinued that so-called rebate?

Mr. HANNA. That the Maritime Commission insisted on?

Representative DELANEY. Then the rebate had been discontinued.

Mr. HANNA. Yes, sir.

Representative DELANEY. But that was after the President Line had picked up and gone away, is that right?

Mr. HANNA. Yes, sir.

Representative DELANEY. I am very much interested in your interlocking of corporate entities. Now would you say that the shipping interests are interlocked with the plantation owners?

Mr. HANNA. Yes, sir.

Representative DELANEY. And the canneries are interlocked with the shipping interests?

Mr. HANNA. The canneries? I don't know, sir. I believe American Can isn't.

Representative DELANEY. But is there an interlocking between the shippers, the lessees, and the owners of the land?

Mr. HANNA. Yes, sir.

Representative DELANEY. And land is leased by a group of directors to a group who will work the soil, is that right?

Mr. HANNA. That's right, sir.

Representative DELANEY. And then those same people will give to the Matson Line the right to carry the sugar?

Mr. HANNA. That's right, sir.

Representative DELANEY. And then there are groups here who can, is that right?

Mr. HANNA. The American Can Co.—well, no, the American Can Co. I believe furnishes the cans here. However, I believe that the pineapple companies do their own canning.

Representative DELANEY. Are the people who control that canning phase independent of the planters?

Mr. HANNA. I believe American Can Co. is; yes, sir. I really don't know.

Representative DELANEY. You couldn't say on that phase?

Mr. HANNA. I couldn't say.

Representative DELANEY. How many large pineapple growers are there in Hawaii?

Mr. HANNA. I believe there are seven, sir.

Representative DELANEY. Do you know how many people are engaged by these seven companies?

Mr. HANNA. I don't know, but it runs into many thousands.

Representative DELANEY. How many independent growers of pineapples are there on the islands?

Mr. HANNA. Well, the independent growers, I don't know, but if there are any they are so inconsequential that it wouldn't be of any effect. Five of the companies are Hawaiian Pineapple Co., the Baldwin Packers, Maui Pineapple Co., Kauai Pineapple Co., and Hawaiian Canneries. The others are Libby, McNeil & Libby, independent from the Territory here, and another company.

Representative DELANEY. Now, I understand that the products of this island, both sugar and pineapple are handled by factors on the mainland, is that correct?

Mr. HANNA. Yes, sir.

Representative DELANEY. And the directors of these factor corporations are interlocked with the directors of the planters?

Mr. HANNA. Yes, sir.

Representative DELANEY. And the directors of these factors are interlocked with the shipping interests?

Mr. HANNA. And the processors of the sugar and pineapple.

Representative DELANEY. And is that the basis for your theory that monopoly exists here on the islands?

Mr. HANNA. Not only as one phase. I look at monopoly through your interlocking directorate of all these various companies, not only of sugar and pineapple, but their subsidiary companies they control through directorships, through stock and through other methods.

Representative DELANEY. Has any request been made to the Attorney General of the United States to investigate this alleged monopoly?

Mr. HANNA. I don't know, sir.

Representative DELANEY. In your official capacity as a representative here, have you brought to the attention of the Attorney General the facts that it is rumored that monopolies exist here on the island?

Mr. HANNA. No, sir; I have not.

Representative DELANEY. Do you know whether any investigation has been made by the Attorney General of the United States relative to these alleged monopolies on the islands?

Mr. HANNA. I understand years ago, I don't know whether it was the United States Attorney General, I believe Ingram Stainback was interested in two or three trust-busting businesses we had over here. I don't recall just exactly what they are at the present time.

Representative DELANEY. You realize, under the Federal laws of the United States that monopoly, under the Sherman Act, is a crime, is that right?

Mr. HANNA. Yes, sir; it is.

Representative DELANEY. It's the duty of the citizens to bring to the attention of the Attorney General the fact that crimes are being committed, if and when they are?

Mr. HANNA. True.

Representative DELANEY. And if you believe that monopolies exist, is it not your duty and the duty of every other citizen to bring that to the attention of the Attorney General and request an investigation be made?

Mr. HANNA. It probably is, sir. May I say this? While on the island of Maui the people of Lahaina asked me to appear before the United States district attorney on the pollution of Lahaina Bay, where the sugar company and the pineapple companies over there were letting all their foliage and leaves and water and all of that type of thing come down into the bay, polluting the bay, so the people could no longer swim there. I went to the United States Attorney General's office and I called many times. I have gotten no consideration on that at all. Now, I believe if I am correct in the statement, I believe in Hawaii there has been a change of United States Attorneys General, possibly this has been during the last 5 or 6 months, possibly that had some bearing on it.

Representative DELANEY. Is it necessary that a man, in order to be appointed attorney general in the Hawaiian Islands be a resident for 3 years?

Mr. HANNA. That I don't know, sir. I couldn't answer.

Representative DELANEY. To your knowledge has any investigation been made in the last 5 years, withdraw that—the last 10 years by the Attorney General of the United States relative to monopolies?

Mr. HANNA. I couldn't answer that, sir.

Representative DELANEY. In part of your testimony you used the word "intimidation" and "coercion." Do you know of any instances where anyone was intimidated or coerced?

Mr. HANNA. I do, sir. And I have been myself, but I can't, as I said before to Mr. Larcade, get those people up at a statehood formal gathering like this. They won't come. For instance, my book, these books on the mainland are a common everyday occurrence. They don't—I can get this distributed on the mainland very easily. In fact, I sent 25,000 copies recently to the mainland to get distribution.

Representative DELANEY. I asked you a simple question, Mr. Hanna, whether you know of any instances of where anyone had been—

Mr. HANNA. Not that I could bring before the committee, sir.

Representative DELANEY. So what you testified to was hearsay?

Mr. HANNA. My own conclusions.

Representative DELANEY. Your own conclusions from what you had an opportunity to observe?

Mr. HANNA. As I said before, from many things we know here in the Territory. We can't all the time prove them, but that doesn't make them untrue. Might I suggest that if the committee had more time and went around among the people they could find out a lot of this type of thing for themselves.

Representative DELANEY. Yes. Now, during your testimony you mentioned something about the raising of home products, products to be consumed here on the island?

Mr. HANNA. Yes, sir.

Representative DELANEY. Is it your opinion that this community can furnish itself with all necessary fresh vegetables, green vegetables and fruits?

Mr. HANNA. It could be self-subsisting on that.

Representative DELANEY. Yes. Now, can these vegetables be raised the entire year round? [See Statement No. 54.]

Mr. HANNA. Most of them, yes, sir. We do have some planting seasons on these various agricultural products, but most of them can be.

Representative DELANEY. Well, I was led to believe here yesterday, I don't want you to qualify as an expert, that crops of this type can only be raised seasonably, and that accounts for the importation of vegetables and fruit from the mainland. Is that true?

Mr. HANNA. I would say this: I would say in some cases that may be. The packaging and the presenting of the products from the mainland looks better and appears better to people than some of the agricultural produce that we grow over here. However, this place could be self-subsisting.

Representative DELANEY. And since Pearl Harbor day, has it not, or is it not a fact that the people of this island have grown more vegetables and fruits than they have prior to that time?

Mr. HANNA. I couldn't tell you exactly. I have looked over reports from the board of forestry and agriculture here, and I don't quite remember what the score on that was.

Representative DELANEY. Well, you said——

Mr. HANNA. It can be done, though.

Representative DELANEY. You led us to believe from your testimony, rather I gathered that the reason that there were few small farms was because the Matson Line wanted to carry in the fruits and vegetables, is that what you intended?

Mr. HANNA. Partly, yes, not only fruits and vegetables, but all other products coming into the Territory. There would be no point in sending the Matson boats, economically speaking, to the mainland full and coming back empty.

Representative DELANEY. It's your belief, is it, that that's the reason for curtailing small truck farms?

Mr. HANNA. That's one of them.

Chairman TAYLOR. I'd like to finish with this witness, if it is agreeable.

Representative DELANEY. Are you able to name for this committee the combine known as the Big Five?

Mr. HANNA. The entity here in the Territory referred to as the Big Five is the five corporations that I mentioned a while ago, also their subsidiary companies and holdings.

Representative DELANEY. And is it your belief that these Big Five are interlocked in such a manner as to create a monopoly?

Mr. HANNA. I do; yes, sir.

Representative DELANEY. And thereby restrain trade?

Mr. HANNA. Yes, sir.

Representative DELANEY. And free enterprise?

Mr. HANNA. For instance, I might mention a case of Kress & Co. over here having a hard time getting into the Territory originally. The property was bought under an assumed name, I believe, and they finally got in after quite a while. And other people have had a hard time getting in here.

Representative DELANEY. Now we will go to home sites. Do you believe that there is a shortage of building land for home sites?

Mr. HANNA. Yes, sir.

Representative DELANEY. Do you believe that the prices asked for home sites are exorbitant?

Mr. HANNA. They are extremely exorbitant.

Representative DELANEY. And is it not a fact that the assessed valuations of these home sites advertised for sale in your local papers are many, many times below the asking price?

Mr. HANNA. They are, sir.

Representative DELANEY. And that, to your knowledge, nothing has been done to bring the actual assessed valuation up to the true value or the offered price?

Mr. HANNA. To my way of thinking there hasn't been, sir.

Representative DELANEY. And that a housing shortage actually exists here in Hawaii?

Mr. HANNA. Extremely so.

Representative DELANEY. And the way to relieve a housing shortage is to make available a plentiful supply of home sites?

Mr. HANNA. That's right, sir.

Representative DELANEY. And when building materials are being shipped, that that would relieve the situation?

Mr. HANNA. Yes, sir. I might suggest that if the Congressmen have time they may take one of our local papers here and find two or three houses that are advertised, with the price, and go take a look at them.

Representative DELANEY. We have already done that. Now, do you know of any effort being made to provide this community with home sites at a reasonable figure?

Mr. HANNA. An effort was made, sir, by myself during the last legislature, with the Governor, on house bill 475, which would create a Territorial homes authority, with an appropriation of \$2,000,000. The Territory would condemn lands and pay for them as they condemned them. They would resell them to the people that are looking for home sites, for a very small percentage for handling charges only.

Representative DELANEY. And what happened to that bill?

Mr. HANNA. Well, sir, it died a very horrible death.

Representative DELANEY. Notwithstanding the conditions that you describe, you feel that the Territory should be admitted to immediate statehood?

Mr. HANNA. I do, sir, because I think that by admitting the Territory to immediate statehood, possibly some of these reforms can be fulfilled.

Representative DELANEY. All right.

Chairman TAYLOR. I think we'll suspend at this time until 2 o'clock. Will you come back, Mr. Hanna, as some of these other men might like to discuss some of these problems with you?

(The hearing recessed at 12:15 p. m., to reconvene at 2 p. m.)

AFTERNOON SESSION

The session was called to order by Acting Chairman Taylor at 2 p. m.

(Hal Hanna, a witness in favor of statehood, resumed and testified further as follows:)

Representative MILLER. You made a statement, Mr. Hanna, relative to the length of lease and price of pastoral land, and I noticed in your booklet that it is around 27½ cents an acres and in some places 13 cents. For how long are those leases? Those are Government lands, are they not?

Mr. HANNA. Yes, sir.

Representative MILLER. Territorial lands?

Mr. HANNA. Yes, sir.

Representative MILLER. How long are the leases for; have you any idea?

Mr. HANNA. Well—pardon me just a moment. I don't have a copy of the land booklet brought out by the Commissioner of Public Lands. That would give it in there.

Representative MILLER. Well, are they long leases or short term?

Mr. HANNA. They are usually long leases.

Representative MILLER. Usually long? Do you know whether or not—I appreciate that this isn't a proper question necessarily directed to you—but do you know whether or not there is a clause in the organic act, or a Territorial law, that limits the term of leases of public lands?

Mr. HANNA. I really don't know, sir. I know the leases, some of them, run 20 years; some of them run over that.

Representative MILLER. They do?

Mr. HANNA. Yes.

Representative MILLER. That's all.

Chairman TAYLOR. Mr. Farrington, have you any questions you'd care to ask this witness?

Delegate FARRINGTON. No.

Chairman TAYLOR. Judge Robertson?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Well, Mr. Hanna's statement covers such a broad field that it would take at least half a day to cross-examine him. In view of his statement that he is in favor of immediate statehood, I have no questions.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Chairman, could I qualify a statement I made for Mr. Delaney this morning on a question that you asked me, when you, Mr. Delaney, asked me about immediate statehood? I believe in immediate statehood, but by immediate I didn't mean this year or next year. I mean possibly a year or two. But I would like to clarify the statement made by me this morning concerning statehood. I misunderstood your time element when you asked me if it was for immediate statehood; I said "Yes," and by that I mean that statehood would not grant additional powers to the voters to change their custom of retaining lands that should be in charge of the potential home owners. I believe in the American system of democracy, which is a full right of self-government. And the majority of our voters do not fully realize yet the power of the ballot and the advantage of cooperative expression thereof to exercise it to the full benefit of the greatest majority of the people. Rapid strides are continuing to be made, and indications are that they will continue to be made, in exercising the full power of the ballot. We still have need for further educational effort to qualify our citizens for the full individual responsibility that rests on the shoulders of good American citizens. This statement should not be construed to mean that there is a lack of ambition, which I believe rests deeply in the heart of most of the people of Hawaii generally.

This, consequently, I firmly believe: that by immediate statehood I mean that a year or two more will find us fully qualified to take our place by the side of the States of our country.

Representative DELANEY. You didn't expect statehood within a month, did you? It would be very fortunate if this became the forty-ninth State within a year.

Mr. HANNA. Well, I misconstrued your question, but I just wanted to clarify the record.

Chairman TAYLOR. Any further questions, gentlemen? (No response.) Thank you, Mr. Hanna.

(Witness excused.)

Chairman TAYLOR. If it is agreeable to the committee, we will proceed out of order, and this gentleman would like to be the next witness. Would you step up and give us your name, please?

TESTIMONY OF DAVID M. KAAPUAWAOKAMEHAMEHA, A WITNESS IN FAVOR OF STATEHOOD

Mr. KAAPUAWAOKAMEHAMEHA. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, Aloha Kakouanui Loa! That's Hawaiian language.

Chairman TAYLOR. That's a little unfamiliar to the New Yorkers.

Mr. KAAPUAWAOKAMEHAMEHA. That means, "How do you do and welcome."

Chairman TAYLOR. Just take a seat, sir, and speak a little more loudly. The committee is anxious to get something of your background so that we will know who you are.

Mr. KAAPUAWAOKAMEHAMEHA. Thank you.

Chairman TAYLOR. And will you give that to us first?

Mr. KAAPUAWAOKAMEHAMEHA. Gentlemen, my name is David Kaapuawaokamehameha; born at the other side of the island; only native who is living in grass houses, or the only native that is living in grass houses for a period of 20 years; educated and only have third-grade grammar-school education; read very little, speak English very little—pidgin—of course, with a little common sense; qualified as a juror by Circuit Court of Hawaii—Judge Buck passed me even then, even if I don't know how to spell the words "guilty" and "not guilty." But I know what guilty is, and my verdict was not appealed; it was not appealed by any case that I gave judgment guilty or not guilty.

I am known to my community here as the biggest liar on this side of the Pacific Ocean. [Laughter.] And I must be a good liar. Our Honorable Delegate Farrington here was my regular caller with his honorable guests, and that lie must be good.

In 1933 I had the honor of having our beloved President to be my guest, and the only Hawaiian home that he really had been to, where he stopped. I will have a monument in respect of that beloved man. And if he only had lived another 10 years more he would have educated the whole world, how human beings should live as human beings. But anyhow, his time was up. He was promoted to that beautiful world, and I hope you gentlemen carry on his wonderful work for the wonders of our country.

For this background I hope you wouldn't doubt that I am a bad liar but I am a good one. So I have no written statement to make today, but raw material from my own background at home. I am a farmer

in life, occupied as a park-keeper in the city and county of Honolulu, and I am here to speak for my small, little Hawaiian folks that have the nerve to come out and to face something big. So I'm the only one who has nerve enough to say I am going, because those gentlemen from Washington are just like you and I. So here I am. Thank you.

So if my qualifications be agreeable to you gentlemen, I'll be so happy.

Chairman TAYLOR. All right, let's now get to the subject which is germane.

MR. KAAPUAWAOKAMEHAMEHA. I bring my raw material. We call it kalo or taro. [Showing a plant.]

Chairman TAYLOR. I think you will have some difficulty in getting that into the record.

MR. KAAPUAWAOKAMEHAMEHA. Well, if you are going to take this into the record, we'll skip it. This package contains raw fish. [Opening a package and showing a fish.] In this container, a calabash, is contained our staple food, poi. I'm not here to demonstrate. This is water [showing a bottle of liquid], not only water but living water that God created for us. Well, I'll describe that later. So as you see, all of this—and there is another item that is more dear to my people—the Holy Bible [showing a book] the foundation of our country, and right should be right and wrong is wrong. This completes my argument.

My people were found and called pagan in the dark age. All right. Those gentlemen came and I am glad they did come. So they say to David's people, "This is the proper way to live." We, as religious people, adopted it. The result today—we hold it so tight that when we look underneath we are losing ground. But I'll still hope and am living in hope that some day God in His true word would put back those little losing plots of ground and wet every Hawaiian—only 15,000 more—so that we would enjoy a little bit of the trueness of this wonderful book. I don't know much how to read, and I never read much, but I believe everything that is contained in it. I believe it. [Showing the Bible.]

This is our staple food [showing a plant], and there is lacking one thing in the Hawaiian life—lack of water. We cannot grow anything without water and the native cannot live. So bring back this and put the Hawaiian back to his proper place, and it might help our people to get back, and all will be happy again under the Stars and Stripes of America. With this as a guide, thank you.

Speaking first of my subject is the fish purpose. Now, they told us, you will obey the laws of your country; it's tabu to go here and tabu to go there, and don't catch this and don't catch that. It belongs to the big shots or kings, royalty. And they said not to do it and we try to better things for you. But somehow those who changed those laws have found some laws that's sweet to them, so they're still in practice, which is the fishing rights, where I got this fish from. This is an akule fish. [Showing a fish.] It's one of the most tasty foods. It might sound disgusting to you, but we eat it raw, cooking it, or whatever way you want it. But if you ask me what I prefer most, I eat it raw. And where I get that fish from it said "tabu," restriction, I cannot go there to get it. [Laughter.]

Now, if our honored Delegate and our good gentlemen would only have consideration sometime later or sooner and take the trouble to repeal those laws and make us live, make the Hawaiians live and assure us a better life—do you see my point, gentlemen? So that's one point that's all pau. That's one subject.

A bottle of water [showing a bottle of liquid]—water became so valuable that they commercialize it. Without water we can't live. The people in Molokai, the poor Hawaiians, don't know how to live in dry land. Give them some wet land, and you will give them something; give something to the beloved people who give everything from their back to the malihini and are happy about it. And this still exists. And if you come to my home, I'll give you everything that I've got and think nothing of it. So, gentlemen, that's in that stage; it's all pau; it means finished—pau.

Coming down to statehood, what protection will we Hawaiians have when statehood is adopted? What protection? As the Territory is concerned today, we have no "look-in." And if we adopted statehood, still we have no work, but if something is wrong here, we can call up to Uncle Sam and to you boys: "Hey, help please, Uncle, something is wrong!" [Laughter.]

So you gentlemen appear again, and I get an opportunity to speak to you again face to face, not to pass it to the other guy, who passes the buck, and it never reaches you. But it's a golden opportunity that I have to express my thoughts.

Now, gentlemen, I like statehood, and that was one of my welcome speeches to our President. I said I would like to live and during my lifetime this would be the forty-ninth State of the Union. He smiled at me. I remember that day. He said, "I hope that it will be granted." But as the Hawaiians say, "Don't be hasty, but make a good study of it."

And, gentlemen, for the protection of my people, grant us statehood. Our Delegate—I have much good feeling for him; he works so hard, but he forgets one point, the important part, the smallest thing—that the natives of these islands should be taken care of first. Then the big problems come after. It's all right with the big interests. They are talking in the millions. But I'm not trying to hurt the goose that laid the golden egg. With them it's wonderful. But with them they have to shoot straight. As I live, with the Bible and with my taro, I find it's too much of a bevel here. [Indicating beveled edge of Bible.] They have to shoot straight. It's all right, because they are the backbone of the island, but if they give us a trade level, that's the golden rule. But I'm not asking that favor. I just want a little bit more, a little bit of the profit.

So, gentlemen, with these few remarks I'd like to say that your trip to Hawaii gives me pleasure, and I hope that someday you will be coming back to the islands, and I extend my invitation to you. Your trip to the islands will not be complete if you never visit my home, and it will be an honor to have you. It's all native. Never mind the job. Forget it, because you only live once. So, good day and God bless you all. [Applause.]

Chairman TAYLOR. Thank you. Are there any questions, gentlemen?

Representative ANGELL. May I ask, you are in favor of statehood, are you?

Mr. KAAPUAWACKAMEHAMEHA. Not otherwise; that something be done first for our people, but still the Hawaiians have a big heart, a big heart. The Bible says, "Don't condemn those who condemn you, but love them." But if it's beyond the convenience of your minds that we deserve to have statehood—please grant it to us; don't let this oppose it. But if you see that something has to be done for us before you grant it, let your conscience be your guide. [Applause.]

Chairman TAYLOR. Any more questions?

Representative DELANEY. No.

(Witness excused.)

TESTIMONY OF JOHN F. G. STOKES, A WITNESS IN OPPOSITION TO STATEHOOD

Representative DELANEY. Mr. Chairman, before this gentleman qualifies, may I have the right to ask him one question?

Chairman TAYLOR. Yes.

Representative DELANEY. Mr. Stokes, are you opposed to statehood?

Mr. STOKES. I am opposed to statehood until we are ready for it.

Representative DELANEY. And will you testify as to your reasons, will you, yes or no? You will testify as to your reasons, the reasons you are opposed to statehood?

Mr. STOKES. Absolutely. That's the reason I am coming here.

Chairman TAYLOR. Now, Mr. Stokes, would you give this committee something of your background so that we will be enlightened as to who you are?

Mr. STOKES. I have been a resident in this Territory for 47 years, a citizen for nearly 42; born in Australia; 30 years at the Bishop Museum, most of the time as Curator of Polynesian Ethnology, most of the time curator in charge. I studied Japanese history for a special purpose, to see what influence, ancient influence, there was in Hawaii from Japan.

Chairman TAYLOR. And how are you presently engaged?

Mr. STOKES. I am still studying, I am studying Hawaiian history, have written a number of papers and collaborated in compiling a Hawaiian dictionary, and things of that kind. Pardon me 1 minute. For the last year and three-quarters I have been a volunteer assistant in the OPA to try and keep the costs of our living down.

Chairman TAYLOR. Well, I guess with those qualifications and that statement we can proceed, Mr. Stokes.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, you probably will be surprised at the small number of people appearing here in opposition to statehood. I have here two anonymous letters which I had received since a brief talk against statehood before a public forum [handing two letters to the chairman], both obviously from Japanese, in addition to which I have had an anonymous telephone call. It isn't the first time that these have come. In other words, anyone opposing statehood and bringing in the Japanese question is a target for bombardment of this kind.

Regarding statehood for Hawaii, one thing is always in mind locally, namely, that once granted, we cannot go back. This permanence is a matter of joyful anticipation by the proponents of immediate statehood—

Chairman TAYLOR. I'm sorry to interrupt you at this point, but have you prepared a written statement that you wish to have us include in the record of the proceedings here?

Mr. STOKES. I have drafted a statement for my own guidance.

Chairman TAYLOR. Would you like to offer it?

Mr. STOKES. It is not in shape to offer.

Chairman TAYLOR. Then we will proceed, and I hope you realize that there are a number of witnesses who have to be examined this afternoon, and if you will make it as brief and concise as possible, I am sure the committee will appreciate it.

Mr. STOKES. All right, Mr. Chairman. I should like to mention also that I put my name in on Friday, was notified that I'd come on on Tuesday, was postponed until Wednesday, and postponed until today, with various changes. There has been no lack on my part in urging a hearing.

Chairman TAYLOR. I regret that you have been inconvenienced and am willing to give you ample time to discuss whatever you have to discuss before this committee.

Mr. STOKES. As I said, this permanence is a matter of joyful anticipation by the proponents of immediate statehood, but is a matter of grave concern to those who believe the time is not ripe. I believe if statehood were granted, and if it were possible that we should be put on trial for, say a period of 25 years, and if, not workable then the matter reversed—I do not know if that is permissible. Another way to meet the proponents of statehood who claim insufficient representation is to allow further representatives from Hawaii to the Congress of the United States.

In any case, the condition of diplomatic settlement in this region is unsuitable for a present commitment on the question. Hawaii is separated from the motherland to the northeast by a vast unbroken stretch of ocean, but reaches out along stepping stones to the west, southwest, and south to an extended empire of small islands with economic potentialities paralleling its own. A combination of all with Hawaii for defensive purposes is important. Many of the islands, although captured by the United States, await international disposition. If awarded to us, as seems reasonable, Hawaii will be the natural focal point through which Washington administers them. A commitment now would only cause a complication later on.

Were we a State and this island empire placed in the hands of our legislators to administer, are they qualified? And has this community exercised intelligence in electing them?

It is axiomatic that a law-making body should lead in obeying the laws, yet our Territorial legislature has willfully and persistently set at naught the law creating it, namely, the organic act passed by Congress in 1900. This is the Constitution of the Territory of Hawaii. It requires that the Territorial legislature shall from time to time reapportion its membership on the basis of the citizen population of the various districts of the Territory. Such has never been done, with the result that the Territory is now controlled by a very definite minority of voters, despite the protests of the majority.

For example: Last year the number of registered voters—roughly corresponding to the citizen population—was 51,006 for this island of Oahu, and 33,320 for the rest of the Territory, making a total of

84,326. Thus, of the Territory's 15 senators, the legal apportionment for Oahu is 9 instead of 6 as at present. Of the 30 representatives, Oahu's legal apportionment is 18, instead of the 12 now allotted. Ignoring the requirement of Congress, and the steadily increasing population of Oahu, no change has been made by our legislature since the beginning of the Territory in 1900, nor, in fact, in proportion since the Republic of Hawaii was formed in 1894.

Through this defiance of our basic law, Oahu with three-fifths of the voting population is subordinated to the rest of the Territory with only two-fifths of the total voters—an intolerable situation for which we of this Territory are responsible. If, by this time, we have not achieved a truly representative government as a Territory, have we really qualified for the greater responsibility of statehood?

The behavior of our legislative members is not encouraging. Among other things, unnecessary extra sessions have been forced through wasting of time and failure to pass the appropriation bill. This began with the first, nicknamed "lady dog legislature," and has occurred several times since.

Unfair tactics at the elections are increasing. The open primary is claimed by candidates to be abused through "plunking" for a weak opposing party candidate whom they are sure to defeat in the finals.

The racial issue came strongly to the front in the last election, on which the Honolulu Advertiser commented editorially:

Regrettable racial issues were introduced into the recent political campaign by leaders from whom better judgment was to be expected. Ill feeling and sense of injury were caused that will be long in healing * * *

And it went on for some little time.

One phase of it led to the defeat for reelection of Representative Kimball by circulating lying rumor and fanning into a flame the racial hatred engendered.

Kimball, with a strong Nisei following—"Nisei" is a term coming into use for Americans of Japanese ancestry; it's a Japanese term and it will probably be found in the latest editions of the dictionary—Kimball, with a strong Nisei following, had been elected twice as a Republican, and once as a Democrat. Being a close friend of the Japanese and Nisei, he attempted to save them from evacuation to mainland concentration camps, as was being considered by the armed services early in the beginning of the war. Kimball and several of the Japanese elements drew up an alternate plan which was submitted to a civic group. That Kimball's action was approved by the Nisei is shown by his reelection later in the same year, 1942.

During the 1944 elections, however, rumors were circulated that Kimball was an enemy of the local Japanese, and had recommended that they be moved to the mainland and concentrated there.

I present here in duplicate the advertisements that tell the story [handing several large photostats to the chairman]. Photostats 1 and 2 are made from advertisements in the Hawaii Times, a Japanese-English newspaper of November 4 and 6, respectively, just before the election on Tuesday, November 7, 1944. [Exhibit Nos. 49A and 49B.]

The first, signed by five prominent Nisei, emphatically denied the truth of the rumor and explained Mr. Kimball's action as beneficent to the Japanese. The second advertisement, anonymous but said to be inserted by the Republican committee, quoted from the denial a

small portion without its context and gave it a twist by altering a word. Then followed what was called an "Excerpt from minutes of (so and so) * * * meeting," ended by "The above is a verbatim statement from the record."

What Mr. Kimball's exact words were is not given, nor his subsequent remarks in the discussion which followed, but the minutes themselves, read with a calm eye, corroborate the denials in the first advertisement.

However, it is almost a racial characteristic of the Japanese to bear a calm and placid expression until they feel they are slighted, or refused what they want, and then they see red. Mr. Kimball's Nisei bloc, showing its approval of his help by reelecting him in 1942, listened to the rumors in 1944, merely glanced at the pseudo confirmation in the second advertisement, and stamped. The trick was a very crafty one.

During this election, also, candidates from both parties devoted much time declaring their love for the Japanese, and very little time on the questions of government. The reason is obvious when we examine the list of registered voters classified by racial extraction. The latest date is 1940, when the Nisei roster exceeded in number that of any other group, namely, 27,107. The others were, Caucasian, 26,322; Hawaiian, 21,581; Chinese, 7,422; and others, 4,880, the total being 87,312. The classification by race was discontinued that year, but in the preceding 10 years the Nisei registrations increased by 20,090 with biennial jumps varying from 3,330 to 5,079; the Caucasian increase was 7,226 with changes swinging from a loss of 564 to a gain of 4,838; the Hawaiian showed a gain of 1,723 for the decade, with negligible gains and losses in successive biennia. On the basis of the biennial gains or losses, estimates of the relative racial voting strength this year would be: Nisei, 40,000; Caucasian, 28,000; Hawaiian, 22,500; and for 1956, the expectations for the Nisei would be 65,000; Caucasian, 37,000; Hawaiian, 24,000. Thus, the probabilities are that by that year, the Nisei vote will either dominate the electorate, or will do so very soon afterward.

Thus will have been accomplished what the Government of Japan attempted toward the end of the nineteenth century, namely, the control of Hawaii by Japanese. Then Japan poured into Hawaii her people in great numbers, over the protest of the Republic of Hawaii, and simultaneously demanded for them Hawaiian franchise. Rejections by the Republic brought threats of war, averted only by our annexation to America.

These Japanese immigrants remained, retained their own culture, formed tight communities, imported picture brides from Japan, and raised and educated their children as Japanese except as the Hawaiian Government required attendance at public schools. Many of the children were sent to Japan for their schooling.

It is the children and grandchildren of these enemy aliens who are about to dominate Hawaii's electorate.

It was also from these children and grandchildren that regiments were formed and sent to fight America's battles. Many people were surprised at their successes. I was not. Many of the parents had been army men in Japan, fanatically ready to die as was demonstrated in the late war. The young people had all the stuff in them for first-

rate army men, needing only proper training and leadership. This they got.

Unfortunately for their readjustment to civil life, the unlimited praise heaped on Hawaii's Nisei soldiers, to the almost entire exclusion of local soldiers of other races, has given them an exaggerated idea of their accomplishments and importance. It is a racial characteristic. Its parallel may be found in the world's unstinted praise for the people of Japan who emerged from a barbaric stage and rapidly absorbed western ideas and mechanical methods. This inflated Japan's ego so that she believed she could lick the world—and, as you know, she tried it.

Many Nisei veterans are demanding concessions far in excess of those to which veterans are entitled. In addition, there is reason to believe that the Japanism in the Nisei may be still rampant, as instanced by the views of a Nisei caterer in 1944, imparted to me by a friend. The caterer, fluent in Japanese and English, refused the call for interpreters and translators, because the Japanese—as stated—frowned on such and she would be unable to arrange a Japanese marriage for her daughter. It was also explained that the local Japanese regarded the Nisei volunteers as traitors.

In addition it was stated that some of the Nisei soldiers returning from Europe said that they had seen their friends killed by white men, that they themselves had already killed white men, and that if such things here did not go as they wanted them they would not mind killing more.

The name of my informant, of course, I will not reveal here, but if the FBI want an interview, I am sure it could be arranged.

The Kimball episode given above serves as a denial of the claim that bloc voting does not occur in Hawaii among the Nisei. It was the Nisei bloc that elected Kimball twice as a Republican, once as a Democrat, and then rejected him in a fit of anger aroused by an appeal to their race prejudice. Another instance of Nisei bloc voting occurred previously when the bloc, supposed to be in the pocket of the vested interests, was dug out and captured by a candidate. I need not dwell on this now, because I understand the candidate will give you full particulars.

The danger of bloc voting among the Nisei may be understood through the parental control by the alien parent over the American citizen. Many Nisei are trying to break away from their Japanese parents, but the Japanese national habit is very strong.

Of these Japanese parents, many are yet unwilling to believe that Japan was defeated, and have gone to the uplands above Pearl Harbor to witness the entry of the Japanese fleet.

With the parental control, the matter of loyalty becomes serious for a while. What would have happened here had a Japanese landing been made might be surmised from the action of the local Japanese in Manila. No report has reached us that they lined up with Americans and Filipinos, but rather that they turned against them when the conquerors strutted in.

In regard to this matter of poor attendance of people opposed to statehood, the primary reason is a matter of fear. It is constantly discounted. It is true, but it is the type of thing that cannot be proved for the reasons which become evident, I hope. Fear has prevented

many from expressing their opposition to statehood. This is understandable. After early trading and whaling days, Hawaii's economy depended on a system of peonage—namely, contract labor on the plantations—controlled by the overlord owners who, with their hirelings, have continued to dominate the Territory. Our overlords, or vested interests, have never emancipated themselves from the peonage idea, and by means of implied threats and pressure tactics, have instilled in otherwise independent thinkers among the wage earners and small businessmen a fear of expressing their thoughts openly when not acceptable to the powers that be.

Before scornfully denouncing such fearsome individuals, consider again our geographical situation—isolated by more than 2,000 miles of ocean from the mainland; all transportation is in the hands of the same vested interests through their absorption of competitors; and even if we were defiantly independent, the cost of travel is prohibitive to most of us. Could we cross the border of the nearest State on foot, or thumb a ride, we would feel freer, but the limitation of our geographical situation makes a perfect set-up for control by our overlords.

Take, for example, the largest local firm, founded originally by two missionaries who retired from the mission and went into business. Through its subsidiaries and interlocking directorates, it has a finger in almost every large business and reaches into every home.

From several sources I have learned that it was the custom for its officials to advise its employees how to vote, saying that it would be disastrous if the vote went a certain way, and they might lose their jobs. Of course, the hint was understood.

From a former executive of an insurance company, an affiliate of the firm referred to, it was learned that the employees in the plantations controlled were advised to place their various personal insurances with the said insurance company. None could refuse, of course, because a check-up would reveal the neglect and an independent man would be marked.

For an innocent but correct remark to a member of another firm, another affiliate, made by a small businessman, he was told that the firm would buy nothing from him in the future.

The control through fear by our vested interests is not exercised openly. Such is unnecessary. It is so well understood by our local citizens that while many have expressed themselves freely to me as opposing the ideas of the local control, practically none has dared to do so in public.

Should you gentlemen desire an up-to-date example of the methods, please observe the published notice of January 4 relating to your own meetings. The heading is: "File by Saturday (the 5th) if You'd Talk on Statehood." And the requirement was the name of the witness and a synopsis of his intended statement for submission to Attorney General Tavares—known to be rabid on the subject of Hawaiian statehood—

Chairman TAYLOR. I think that has all been taken care of by the opening statement of our chairman.

Mr. STOKES. Pardon me. The point I am illustrating is here, Mr. Chairman. (Continuing:) Attorney General Tavares, who is known to be rabid on the subject of Hawaiian statehood. This was denounced in the newspaper of the 6th by the Honorable James L. Coke, retired

chief justice of our supreme court, as an attempt to gag the citizen who believed he had something to contribute. And such was its earmark. You, rather the permanent chairman, has since made everything clear that that was not intended, that it was not intended as the thing was taken, but the point I want to bring over is that it was so taken in view of the background of Hawaii.

Chairman TAYLOR. Well, the later statements in the newspaper disproved all that, do you not agree?

Mr. STOKES. I didn't see that. I saw the Advertiser as it came around.

Chairman TAYLOR. So that there won't be any misunderstanding in the future—and I think it has been borne out by the proceedings to date—our chairman has very aptly taken care of the situation, and there is no such thing as gag rule before this committee, and it is open and free to anyone who wants to come here and state his case. So I don't want you to have any misunderstanding about it either.

Mr. STOKES. That has been clarified subsequently, but I am only speaking of the type of thing that does create fear. That's the sum and total of the point I am trying to make. The rest has been cleared up.

Of course, in some States powerful companies also exercise control of the citizens through fear. Such a condition is not unique. But on the mainland, as already indicated, the citizen can always walk into the next State; here most of us are tied up.

Hence, under statehood, we would be endlessly enslaved because the control by our overlords would be complete and permanent. As a Territory, we always have an Uncle to whom we may appeal. I'll end my remarks on that, gentlemen. The other concerns the anonymous letters that I submitted to you.

Chairman TAYLOR. Now, as to these letters, Mr. Chairman, what are your wishes; do you think they should go into the record?

Representative LARCADE. I don't think anonymous letters should go into the record.

Chairman TAYLOR. With one objection, and we all concur; the letters are not accepted as part of the record.

Representative LARCADE. They are not admissible unless signed.

Mr. STOKES. It is not important except as a bombardment of anonymous letters.

Chairman TAYLOR. Mr. Larcade, do you have any questions that you'd care to ask the witness?

Representative LARCADE. No.

Chairman TAYLOR. Mr. Angell would like to ask you a question.

Representative ANGELL. The testimony that you have given to the committee is an argument against statehood?

Mr. STOKES. Against statehood until we are ready—for postponement.

Representative ANGELL. For what reason? Just why do you contend that statehood should not be granted?

Mr. STOKES. The matter of population is one important thing.

Representative ANGELL. You mean too small a population?

Mr. STOKES. No; the matter—

Representative ANGELL. The character of the population?

Mr. STOKES. The composition, particularly the Nisei voting control. I question very much indeed, in spite of all that has been claimed about the preparedness of the Nisei, about their loyalty, and so on, if they are understood.

Representative ANGELL. Any other reasons that you advance why statehood should not be granted?

Mr. STOKES. That's the important thing. One other thing is the matter of the quality of our legislature, for which we are responsible. It comes back to us again. I point out in particular the matter of reapportionment which they have calmly ignored, even though required to do so.

Representative ANGELL. I presume by reason of your position, then, that it is your belief that statehood should never be granted?

Mr. STOKES. No; I don't believe that it should never be granted. It is a foolish thing to commit myself like that. But I say we are not ready. My idea is that we should postpone it for 20 or 25 years and then take a survey of the population. See here, Mr. Angell, you must not forget that we have the major racial element; through it, Japanese culture has been trained, educated largely by this alien element, this Japanese element; and the parental control is far stronger than it ever is in America. In fact, it is possible that American boys might be better for some of the Japanese system of control. And it has been very hard indeed for these young Nisei to break away from this control, though they see their otherwise American companions exercise the freedom that they do. Now, those people are the first generation, the parents are the first generation, who have come here undoubtedly with the idea of controlling these islands. That thing is clear, as shown by the diplomatic correspondence there at the archives.

Representative ANGELL. Well, do you not believe that any objection on that score could be handled perhaps more easily, say, under statehood than it could under a Territorial government?

Mr. STOKES. It could never be handled under statehood until the ideas of these young Americans of Japanese ancestry are modified.

Representative ANGELL. Well, sitting in the nature of a judge, I have not been able to discern any decisive control exercised by that particular element here in the Territory.

Mr. STOKES. One is not likely to unless they have some idea of the Japanese national psychology. I have gone as deeply into that as I could in the time I have given to it, which extends over a number of years.

Representative ANGELL. Thank you, Mr. Stokes.

Chairman TAYLOR. Any questions, Mr. Miller?

Representative MILLER. None.

Chairman TAYLOR. Judge?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I might ask Mr. Stokes a question or two. Mr. Stokes, you made a statement before the joint congressional committee when you were here in 1937, did you not?

Mr. STOKES. Yes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. And are you opposing annexation on the ground you have repeated here, the Japanese element in the country?

Mr. STOKES. In part.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Largely, was it not?

Mr. STOKES. Quite largely; yes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Your point evidently was that dual citizenship of the Japanese population, was it not?

Mr. STOKES. That was part, that is, that was not highly emphasized, if you will read my statement. There are other things.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Well, you took the position that the local Japanese here were controlled by the Japanese Government, did you not?

Mr. STOKES. What do you mean by the local Japanese? Will you qualify that?

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Japanese in the Hawaiian Islands.

Mr. STOKES. You mean Japanese citizens or certain generations?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Did you draw that distinction in your statement?

Mr. STOKES. I don't remember, but what I had in mind was the matter of the Japanese immigrants. What page are you referring to?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Page 271, Mr. Stokes.

Representative MILLER. It isn't in the record that's before us.

Chairman TAYLOR. Is there some objection? The judge has raised a point that he may have changed his ideas since he testified in 1937. Is that what you mean, Mr. Miller?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I don't think he changed his ideas, but my point is that he should. [Laughter.] Mr. Stokes, on page 271, in the hearing of 1937, it says that you stated—

A Japanese population predominates in the Hawaiian Islands and is more or less under the influence of the Japanese Government.

Mr. STOKES. That certainly could be indicated in view of the children being dominated by their parents and they being dominated by the Japanese Government.

Mr. ROBERTSON. And included in that would be the then existing dual citizenship?

Mr. STOKES. I beg your pardon? Well, the dual citizenship, of course, would be included in that as far as that is concerned. Give me your paragraph and page, please.

Mr. ROBERTSON. All right. Now, then—

Mr. STOKES. Give me your page and paragraph, will you?

Mr. ROBERTSON. What?

Mr. STOKES. Give me your page and paragraph.

Mr. ROBERTSON. At the bottom of page 271. Will you go on from that? In your mind, hasn't a radical change come over the situation since the war was ended and the Japanese Government has practically gone out of the picture?

Mr. STOKES. There are questions that still have to be settled. We still do not know these people. You have been here so long, Judge, that I still believe that you do not fully understand the Japanese. [Laughter and applause.]

Chairman TAYLOR. Just a moment. We have established decorum throughout the entire proceedings and we intend to maintain it, and I do not wish demonstrations and I wish you would adhere to that rule.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Stokes, wouldn't you now admit that the influence of the Japanese Government that you referred to in 1937 no longer exists today?

Mr. STOKES. It is expected that the Japanese Government would not dominate as it did before, but as I pointed out here, the Japanese,

the loyalty of some of those first-generation Japanese is still to the Japanese Government, as illustrated by their belief in the victory of Japan over the United States and their going up to Pearl Harbor, the uplands in Pearl Harbor, to watch the Japanese fleet, victorious fleet, enter Pearl Harbor. You saw that in the papers. It has happened.

Representative DELANEY. Mr. Chairman, I am going to object at this time. I think this committee is fully capable of making an appraisal of the testimony, and I feel that we have heard sufficient at this time.

Chairman TAYLOR. There is an objection on the part of one of the members of the committee, and we will not resume that testimony. Do you care to ask him a question?

Representative DELANEY. No.

Chairman TAYLOR. That is all. Thank you, Mr. Stokes. We will have a short recess.

(A short recess was taken at 3 p. m.)

AFTER RECESS

Chairman TAYLOR. The meeting will come to order. We are ready for the next witness. Would you please state for us and the enlightenment of the committee your name and something of your background?

Mr. EZERA. My name is Levi M. Ezera. I am Hawaiian-born—

Chairman TAYLOR. Pardon me, just a moment. Some of the people in the back say they can't hear, and if you would speak into the "mike" I'm sure they would appreciate it. Just have a seat.

Mr. EZERA. I was born here in the Hawaiian Islands, on this island. My parents were missionaries by the name of John Maliola Ezera, and I am an ordained minister in the Baptist Church; an ordained missionary. And furthermore, that's what I am here for, to bring before the majority the truth, the true Word of God; and with your permission, I will bring this whole audience in the presence of the Almighty.

Chairman TAYLOR. Mr. Larcade, have you any objection to the procedure? [Speaking to witness:] You mean by prayer?

Representative LARCADE. What is that?

Chairman TAYLOR. The witness desires us—is desirous of bringing the whole audience into the presence of God by prayer, which I think is extraordinary.

Representative LARCADE. I think that is out of order.

Chairman TAYLOR. There is an objection against it, and I think you will have to proceed without it.

Mr. EZERA. I'll proceed.

Chairman TAYLOR. Indeed, proceed.

Mr. EZERA (reading):

STATEHOOD

1. The condition in which a person or thing is.
2. Political or social standing; rank; style of living.
3. Ceremonious style of formal dignity; as, to receive in state.
4. A body of people united under one government; a commonwealth.
5. The civil powers of such a community.
6. The territory occupied by it.
7. One of several such communities forming a federation: often written state—adj. 1, pertaining to the politic; as, state papers; 2, used upon formal

or ceremonious occasions: State, pertaining to one, the United States: v. t. (p. t. and p. p. stated, p. pr. stating. To set forth clearly and formally; tell; declare; as, to state the facts (Pono).

Forming nouns from nouns and adjectives, meaning, 1—state, quality, condition, or character of being; as, childhood; likelihood; 2—collective group or body; as, brotherhood; 3—example of; as, falsehood (kolohe).

CIVIL GOVERNMENT

We believe that civil government is of divine appointment and arrangement, for the best interests and good order of human society; and that magistrates are to be prayed for, conscientiously honored, and obeyed; except in matters opposed to the will of our Lord Jesus Christ, who is the only Lord of men's consciences, and the Prince of the Kings of the earth.

Romans 13: 17—(a) Obedience to rulers.

Deuteronomy 16: 18—(a) Justice and pure worship enjoined.

Jeremiah 30: 21—(d) God's redeeming love and Israel's restoration.

Matthew 22: 21—(h) Tribute to Caesar? Captious questions.

First Peter 2: 13—(c) Be subject to human ordinance for the Lord's sake.

Acts 5: 29—(m) The Apostles, again imprisoned, are divinely liberated and preach.

Matthew 10: 28—(e) "Encouraged"; the Twelve Apostles: Commission; cautioned.

Daniel 3: 15-18—(c-d) Daniel's three friends refuse to worship it.

Matthew 23: 10—(t) Which is the Great Commandment? Pharisaism exposed.

Romans 14: 4—(d) Salvation is at hand.

Revelations 19: 6—(b) The Word of God appears.

Psalms 2—The reign of Jehovah's anointed.

THE RIGHTEOUS AND THE WICKED CONTRASTED

We believe that there is a radical and essential difference between the righteous and the wicked; that such only as through faith are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and sanctified by the Spirit of our God, are truly righteous in His esteem; while all such as continue in impenitence and unbelief are in His sight wicked and under the curse; and this distinction holds among men both in and after death.

Matthew 3: 18—(c) The righteous and the wicked distinguished.

Proverbs 12: 26—(z) Sundry proverbs contrasting the upright and the wicked.

Acts 10: 34—(z, h) Peter returns with them and preaches.

Romans 1: 17—(a, b) The gentiles' need of righteousness.

First John 3: 7—(g) Righteousness and brotherly love the mark of God.

First John 2: 29—Children.

Galatians 3: 10—(j) The folly of relapsing to the law: which the covenant of faith antedates.

Proverbs 14: 32—(VI) Sundry proverbs contrasting the upright and the wicked.

Luke 16: 25—(f) The rich man and Lazarus.

Matthew 13: 14—(d) The reason for parables.

THE FINAL STATES

We believe that this earth itself will be redeemed from the curse of sin and fitted as the eternal dwelling place of the people of God; that this fitting of the earth for the eternal home of the redeemed will be by a process of purification by fire or melting; that the finally impenitent and incorrigible wicked will be cast, both souls and resurrected bodies, into Gehenna, or the lake of fire and brimstone, where they shall be punished forever and forever.

Isaiah 66:17—(c) Jehovah's judgments and Zion's enlargement.

Romans 8:20-22—(e) Pledge of complete redemption.

Hebrews 1:10-12—(e) Let us draw near with a true heart.

Second Peter 1:10-13—(j-m) "Be not idle nor unfruitful."

Revelations, chapter 21—Final judgment. The consummation: A new hand on earth.

Chapter 22—The River of Life. "Blessed is he that keepeth the words of this Book." Final testimony, invitation, warning, promise, benediction.

Psalms 9:17—The wicked shall be turned back unto Sheol, even all the nations that forget God.

Proverbs 27:20—Sheol and Abaddon are never satisfied; and the eyes of man are never satisfied.

Ezekiel 31:16—(p) Lamentation over Pharaoh.

Matthew 5:29—(c-d) Of amity, of adultery, of oaths, of retaliation, of love of alms, of prayer. (Jesus comes to fulfill the law and the prophets.)

Matthew 10:28—(e) Encouraged; cost of the service; its rewards.

Mark 12:5—(e) Charge to the disciples: "But I will warn you whom ye shall fear. Fear him, who after he hath killed hath power to cast into hell; yea, I say unto you, fear him."

Jude 7—(h) "Contend earnestly for the faith."

Revelations 20:10—(j) Satan loosed: "And the devil that deceived them was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, where are also the beast and the false prophet; and they shall be tormented day and night forever and ever."

Revelations 12:8—(a-f) War in heaven; renewed on earth.

Revelations 7-12—(7) And there was war in heaven: Michael and his angels going forth to war with the dragon; and the dragon warred and his angels; (8) and they prevailed not, neither was there place found any more in heaven. (9) And the great dragon was cast down, the old serpent, he that is called the Devil and Satan, the deceiver of the whole world; he was cast down to the earth, and his angels were cast down with him. (10) And I heard now is come the salvation, and the power, and the kingdom of God, and the authority of His Christ: for the accuser of our brethren is cast down, who accuseth them before our God day and night. (11) And they overcome him because of the blood of the Lamb, and because of the word of their testimony; and they loved not their life even unto death. (12) Therefore rejoice, O heavens, and ye that dwell in them. Woe for the earth and for the sea: because the Devil is gone down unto you, having great worth, knowing that he hath but a short time.

Chairman TAYLOR. I suggest, Mr. Witness, that you let the stenographer take your written statement. There may be some things

that he didn't get for the record, and if you would leave it for him.

Mr. EZERA. I will.

Chairman TAYLOR. Any questions, gentlemen?

Representative ANGELL. Are you opposed to statehood or in favor of it?

Mr. EZERA. I am in favor of it.

(The witness was excused.)

TESTIMONY OF MARTIN E. ALAN

(Mr. Martin E. Alan took the witness chair next, without introduction.)

Representative DELANEY. May I have the right, Mr. Chairman, to ask one question?

Chairman TAYLOR. Yes.

Representative DELANEY. Is the next witness for or opposed to statehood?

Mr. ALAN. Strictly anti.

Chairman TAYLOR. Have you prepared a statement?

Mr. ALAN. Yes, sir.

Chairman TAYLOR. And do you wish to offer it for the record?

Mr. ALAN. I am; yes, sir.

Chairman TAYLOR. Any objection? [No response.] We'll receive it.

(The document was received and entered in the record as Statement No. 8.)

Chairman TAYLOR. Now, I wish you'd confine yourself to the subject matter that is germane to this issue that is under discussion now.

Mr. ALAN. Yes, sir.

Chairman TAYLOR. And I suggest you not read the statement, inasmuch as we have already put it into the record. So, if you will confine yourself to whatever remarks you can make.

Mr. ALAN. I have a few remarks I can use in lieu. If you want to refer to anything, it is here.

Chairman TAYLOR. Will you please tell this committee before you begin your dissertation something about your background so we will know who you are?

Mr. ALAN. My name is Martin E. Alan. I came here in 1928. This is my second trip here. We came here, my wife and I, for a rest; for my health at that time. We got interested in education and many other things here in the islands. We have delved into Hawaiian lore and history. My wife and I attended the Japanese language school for a year, one of these country language schools. I have worked as superintendent, general foreman on defense projects, and at the present time I am writing, and my wife is writing, but presently she is in the hospital.

Representative ANGELL. Where were you born?

Mr. ALAN. Pittsburgh, Pa., 1897, January 1.

Chairman TAYLOR. All right.

Representative DELANEY. What is your business or profession?

Mr. ALAN. Well, I am a photographer by trade. I work locally, but I try to—well, I do quite a bit of ghost writing, and my wife has published a book and seventy-five-odd stories locally.

Chairman TAYLOR. Ghost writing for whom?

Mr. ALAN. For her, and anybody that wants help.

Chairman TAYLOR. What kind of articles?

Mr. ALAN. Anything they want; local conditions, fiction, or anything.

Representative DELANEY. Suppose, for the sake of argument, I was a proponent for statehood, would you write an article for me on statehood?

Mr. ALAN. I could; but I wouldn't, because I don't believe in it.

Chairman TAYLOR. Let's proceed to business.

Mr. ALAN. I had to rewrite my statement after I saw to what lengths Delegate Farrington, ex-Delegate King, and other statehood speakers went to whitewash the Japanese residents of Hawaii. I have pulled my punches 90 percent in presenting my case against them. After all, a part of that group did wear the American uniform for a time. Also, since rewriting, I learned too late to do a third writing that we antistatehooders were going to be restricted to a short time for our presentations, due to the proponents taking too much of the visiting committee's time, some through long dissertations, some through error, unwitting or otherwise. I omitted purposely a lengthy discussion on finance. That subject was presented by my opponents liberally, and perhaps accurately.

Representative ANGELL. We have limited all witnesses where they have long, prepared statements and put their statements in the record, and ask them to hit the high points, because the committee has very limited time, due to the fact that the Congress reconvenes on the 14th, and we have to get back.

Chairman TAYLOR. We have received your statement in its entirety, and it is 15 pages long, and I think it only fair to the other witnesses who have to testify that you confine yourself as much as possible to the matter in hand.

Mr. ALAN. I am trying to demonstrate to the people of our Hawaii Nei and the committee that we are definitely not ready for statehood now, nor at any predictable near date. The primary reason for this assertion is that the caliber of men available locally for our legislature and other public offices is low, far too low for them to carry us into and throughout statehood. Need I cite the childish, imbecilic actions of our last legislature, to press my point? It is a mild sample of the way politics and political office has been conducted here for many years.

It is a safe estimate that no more than two or three capable local people now sit in the legislature or hold other public office. If the National Congress has watched us at all in the past 25 years, these, then, beyond a doubt, are the reasons why we were not a State in 1920 or before. Certainly, we have not shown competency since then, despite the eloquent testimony of the witnesses the first 3 days of this hearing.

Yes; there is a way to improve the situation. A logical, sensible way. Real, honest-to-goodness three-R education for the coming generations for the next 40 years. By then, we may hope to have an

abundant supply of "home-grown, home-nurtured" candidates, any of whom we might be proud of to lead us into and through our dream of statehood. I conclusively proved and demonstrated beyond a doubt, while living on the Big Island in 1939 and 1940, what this type of education will do for the growing minds of our children. Details on request.

We cannot educate our youth efficiently here in our present school set-up. The D. P. I. leadership is too stagnant and inefficient to realize the needs of the children in the Territory. Flowery statistics, to the contrary from this D. P. I., I have yet to see a local high-school graduate who could even pass the examination I took to get into high school. There isn't 1 student here in 25 who has received his 12 years' schooling in our local regular, nonspecializing, nonprivate schools who can read a page or paragraph out of any book or journal, and when finished, tell intelligently what he or she read. I have tried this test many times the past 8 years on all age groups. We need a minimum of two "island generations" of intensive, sound education for these youngest boys and girls, older ones are hopeless, before they would be even a good gamble to run our community. Then, and only then, should we look toward statehood.

And in the interim of this program, we must solve a virtually impossible Japanese problem beneficially to our Union of States. It can be done, if the present generation have the courage to institute the needed program and legislation, and carry it to a successful conclusion. It means equal courage on the part of the local Japs to accept this transformation, and comply with it in good faith to acquire the greatest good from the program.

There is no question but what the Japanese race is the most imposing element in the present hearing. But it is very, very regrettable that the exponents of statehood now took the unnecessary liberty to drag the A. J. A.'s and their records into this question of statehood. By so doing, you have this group of unfortunates wide open for very critical criticisms from the opponents to statehood now. Detailed information on this subject is contained in those briefs before you.

There was no universal sabotage committed by the local Japs. They had far too much at stake in Hawaii and the United States of America to take any chances of jeopardizing their prize here. The cases of sabotage on record are hard to trace to them. The armed forces in and about Honolulu had only their radios for communication for several days after the blitz. The Army phone lines from Barking Sands to Kalaheo, on Kauai, were cut out near Kenaha night after night for over 2 years 1942-44. I'm very sure the white and Hawaiian people of Kauai did not cut them.

In January of 1942 a Jap submarine entered the port of Port Allen on Kauai. It was first noticed by a civilian guard about 8 p. m. He telephoned the message center in Waiimea for a searchlight and a cannon. Nine hours later, at 5 a. m., a person came strolling down to port with a hand flashlight and asked, "Did you just ask for a light? You want a flashlight?" When the reliefs came on at 7 a. m. they took up the wondering of the night crew and mulled it over till 8 o'clock. Several of the men in charge went to this man's home. The Jap who had received the night message. He was caught in the act of sending Morse code to Tokyo. He was placed in concentration

camp for 2 or 3 months. He was soon on the streets of Waimea again. Since the war started, hundreds of Jap girls have either married or are "shacking-up" with civilians and servicemen. Mixed marriages on the part of the Japs was almost unknown before the war. A girl was kicked out if she married out of her race. Tokyo Rose had a perfect unbroken line of communication from Hawaii all through the war. If the committee has time I can cite dozens of cases of such events and the methods used to get this information out. Only the local Japs were interested to let Tokyo Rose know what was going on in Hawaii. It wasn't too hard. Every officer on Oahu, prewar, who could afford a maid had one or more of these lovely little Jap espionage agents.

There probably would be more espionage and sabotage, but the point is you can't trace any, or little if any, to them legally. It's hard. They are very careful. And I am not trying, I am not making a flat accusation at this time, but the point, the main point is, they will not mix unless it is to their own personal benefit, either individually or as a group. I have found that out over quite a number of years now.

I have studied thoroughly on the subject, for 2 years on the big island, while around Hilo and Honakaa. I worked under cover for the benefit of G-2, getting information for them. I would report on an average of once a week. Much of the information that I got for them had never before been recorded, and it has later been checked, you know, found out that what I told them was so.

Well, there is another thing that bears very directly on espionage more than sabotage, and that is, Tokyo Rose got daily reports of the goings on in the Territory while she was in Tokyo, or supposedly in Tokyo, and we would get those reports back over the radio, short wave, 1, 2, or 3 nights after the supposed occurrence happened. I don't know if the committee wishes to take time, but I could mention quite a number that happened around the airport there. Folks like us are not going to send that information to Tokyo Rose. We are not interested. That leaves only one group open. If the Japanese people were as in good faith and as patriotic as they claim to be, and as the proponents of statehood claim they are, they would have come out in the first 30 days after the war and exposed those who were considered dangerous to the war effort. Instead of that they left it up to somebody else to do. In the first year the arrests were all on the basis of information gained from Pearl Harbor and non-Japanese channels. If you want to mention voting, which isn't in the brief, they are very lax in their voting practices here, extremely so, so much so that if you want to be real technical, every officeholder in the Territory of Hawaii is holding office illegally, every election has been a fraud. If you want to be real technical about it, as I understand it—if I am wrong, correct me—but as I understand it, ballots which are marked wrong intentionally and are known to have been marked wrong, I believe that is fraud, isn't it?

Chairman TAYLOR. Yes, certainly that's fraud. Did you ever go to the district attorney or United States attorney, or whatever you call him here, attorney general, prosecuting officer, and say to him that you knew of some instances where such a fraud had been committed?

Mr. ALAN. No, sir.

Chairman TAYLOR. Why didn't you?

Mr. ALAN. I don't know why I didn't, but I didn't.

Chairman TAYLOR. Do you know of any instances where a fraud of that kind has been perpetrated?

Mr. ALAN. I'll recall an instance where a fraud occurred on the island of Hawaii. I was on the election board there and I helped count votes at night, and they got extremely angry at me because I threw out ballots, the X marks were clear out of the box where they should have been. For instance, two men running for the same office, where one should be chosen, both of them marked. Then they'd tell me, "That's all right, that's all right. Take so and so."

Representative ANGELL. That wouldn't indicate fraud, just negligence or lack of understanding. It certainly wouldn't be fraud to vote for both candidates, because neither one will be counted.

Mr. ALAN. If they do it knowingly?

Representative ANGELL. Who would they accept it for if they are both marked favorably?

Mr. ALAN. Calls on both sides to take so and so. I tell you, I have concluded all I have to say on this thing orally, and the statement in the gentleman's hands, and everything was written in good faith. There is absolutely nothing personal in it. There is nothing personal, and most of it on my part for anyone, Hawaii is not ready for statehood. That's all I have to say, gentlemen.

Chairman TAYLOR. Any questions?

(No response.)

Chairman TAYLOR. Thank you, Mr. Alan.

(Mr. Alan withdraws from witness chair.)

Mr. W. H. Tilley was the next witness called.

Chairman TAYLOR. Will you state your name?

Mr. TILLEY. My name is W. H. Tilley. I have been in the islands since 1916. I am a veteran of two wars. I represent a small group of vociferous veterans of this war. You gentlemen, when you get back on February 14, will hear lots of it.

Representative DELANEY. Mr. Tilley, before you go on, are you opposed to statehood?

Mr. TILLEY. I am in the group that wishes statehood deferred at least 25 years.

Representative DELANEY. You are opposed to immediate admission of the Territory?

Mr. TILLEY. Yes, sir; unqualified. I have about 300 words here. We are all weary of this show they put on this afternoon. I didn't get much out of it. I almost left it. I promised my boys—

Representative DELANEY. You don't attribute that to the actions of the committee, do you?

Mr. TILLEY. No; I think you gentlemen were very forbearing. I would have thrown some of the witnesses out if I had been in your place. However, that's all right. We love everybody in Hawaii. The veterans are interested, when this statehood pie is cut, what kind of pie is it, and how much of the pie do the veterans get. That's why I'm here. We are vitally interested in statehood, and we are interested in good government, but so far the veterans—I have been out of the Army since last June—and as far as the Territory is con-

cerned, the veterans of this war have received little consideration, practically none.

I was born and raised in Boone County, Ky.—

Chairman TAYLOR. If you care to, and there is no objection, you can submit your statement.

Representative DELANEY. No; let him read it.

Delegate FARRINGTON. No, Mr. Chairman; I'd like to have Mr. Tilley read his statement, and take as much time as is necessary to present his point of view. I might say, in connection with the remarks of the previous witness, that I did my best to arrange for this committee to remain in the islands at least 3 weeks, so that there couldn't be any question about the amount of time that would be allowed for hearings. But in view of the pressure of other responsibilities, it is impossible for them to do so. So, any suggestion that I have attempted to restrict the time that is to be allowed the opponents of statehood is without foundation in fact.

Chairman TAYLOR. I think we all concur in that, Mr. Farrington. If you will proceed, please [speaking to witness].

Mr. TILLEY (reading from statement): The writer has lived in Hawaii since 1916. During this period he has left Hawaii for short periods of time during his military service in World Wars I and II. He married and has grown children who are also married and have families in Hawaii. The following are his views on why statehood for Hawaii should be deferred until the following conditions can be corrected in the American manner.

The present manner of the Governor appointing the school commissioners should be changed so that the people can elect their own school board, as is common on the mainland. This would bring the school department closer to the people, and thereby raise the standards of basic English to the same levels that the mainland has.

Up to December 6, 1941, there were thousands of children of grammar- and high-school age that were attending Japanese-language schools, where they were taught the same manners and customs that prevailed in Japan. Statehood should be deferred until such teaching has been forgotten. This might take about 30 years. We have just completed a terrible war with Japan, and the American people will not permit 200,000 people of Japanese descent, who have been in contact with Japanese manners and Japanese customs through these Japanese-language schools, to become citizens of one of the United States of America.

Our leaders, by means of the newspapers, radio, and other sources available to them, have stated that Hawaii is due statehood for the simple reason that they bought more bonds, gave more blood, and paid more taxes than many of the States in Union. That is not a reason for statehood. One man nor a group of men do not buy statehood through the efforts of the citizens. Statehood should be earned by a citizenry becoming educated in American conduct, customs, and, above all, in the American philosophy of life. These are sadly lacking in Hawaii.

Our public leaders have gone the whole way on the publicity given to the exploits of our AJA (American soldiers of Japanese ancestry) soldiers. That is as it should be. We owe them honors and no one should discount any of their achievements. But the rights of state-

hood should not be conferred on a people because of the valor of their soldiers. Everyone is expected to fight the brave fight for our country, regardless of States' rights. The fact that our AJA soldiers did such an excellent job in the armed forces is not now nor never will be any standard on which we can base statehood for Hawaii.

It is the firm belief of the writer that this statehood committee was brought to Hawaii for a selfish purpose, which is to assist in the reelection of the present officials, both Territory and city and county. As has happened before, whenever the politicians feel that some group of people are getting to a point where opposition will be shown to the political oligarchy that has control over our body politic they wave the hope of statehood in the hopes of confusing the people to the real needs of the community, such as slum clearance, housing, basic English in our schools, and a host of other governmental aims that would do the most good for the largest number of our people. The newspapers claim that the last session of our local legislature was the worst in 20 years. (I refer you to the newspapers dated during that session.)

In connection with preference for local veterans, I wish to cite the case of one of our returning veterans, Col. P. M. Smoot, who was for the past 25 years the adjutant general, Hawaiian National Guard. On his return from active service on August 1, 1945, he was not permitted his position as Adjutant General, as the Governor had abolished the military department of the Territory of Hawaii and had appointed an ex-marine major, who, being retired, draws \$330 pension per month as major general, Hawaii Territorial Guard, at a salary of \$630 per month. In addition to his total salary of about \$1,000 per month, he has a master sergeant as a driver. As a veteran of World War I and II, I feel our Governor and any other public officials who permit a veteran of so many years' service in the armed forces of the United States and of the Territory of Hawaii to suffer such treatment do not warrant consideration as officials in the proposed State of Hawaii. Until we can secure better public officials I feel that statehood for Hawaii should be deferred. I will be willing to answer any questions I am capable of answering.

Chairman TAYLOR. Thank you, Mr. Tilley. Are there any questions?

Mr. TILLEY. I may add, Mr. Chairman, you have a bill in Congress now called the District of Columbia bill, permitting the District of Columbia to have representation in the National Congress. It has been ice-boxed in that bill. Hawaii should be included on that bill, and we should be given representation on that, the same as the District of Columbia.

Representative DELANEY. Do I understand you to say that this Territorial committee was brought here for a selfish purpose?

Mr. TILLEY. That's my own opinion.

Representative DELANEY. To serve whose selfish purpose?

Mr. TILLEY. Those who are in office now. They feel that we veterans will probably unseat a few of them. We hope to do so.

Representative DELANEY. You mean both parties who are elected by the people?

Mr. TILLEY. Yes.

Representative DELANEY. Haven't you a right to unseat them in a general election if you see fit?

Mr. TILLEY. We have that right, but it is very difficult to take advantage of that right.

Representative DELANEY. There is nothing wrong with your elections, is there?

Mr. TILLEY. Oh, no. I believe in bloc voting. We are going to use bloc voting in the next election very nicely.

Representative DELANEY. You believe in bloc voting?

Mr. TILLEY. As long as you have the gooney bird.

Representative ANGELL. I do, too, if they vote for me.

Mr. TILLEY. As long as you vote for the gooney bird in the next election, we are in favor of bloc voting.

Representative DELANEY. I believe the Republican Party is entitled to the same privileges as the Democratic Party, except that the members of the Republican Party shouldn't hold office.

Mr. TILLEY. I may add that up until 1935 I was a member of the Democratic Central Committee and a very strong and vociferous Democrat, one of the original Roosevelt for President supporters in Hawaii. I think I was about sixth on the charter, but we have no Democratic Party in Hawaii today.

Chairman TAYLOR. Thank you, Mr. Tilley.

(Mr. Tilley leaves the witness chair.)

Chairman TAYLOR. Mrs. Reinhardt would like to be called out of turn, and if there is no objection on the part of the committee, I'd like to give her that opportunity.

(Mrs. Hattie Saffery Linohaupuaokakoolau Reinhardt was the next witness called.)

Mrs. REINHARDT. Mr. Chairman, I am Hattie Saffery Linohaupuaokakoolau Reinhardt. I was born at Lahaina, Maui, July 1894.

Representative ANGELL. Would you care to be seated?

Mrs. REINHARDT. Thank you.

Chairman TAYLOR. And would you speak into the microphone so the rest of the members of the committee can hear?

Mrs. REINHARDT. I will try my best to talk loud. I was educated in the public schools of Waihee, Maui; Makawo, Maui; Manoa Seminary, Maui. Then when my father and mother moved to Hawaii, at Honakaa, Hamakua, Hawaii, I went to the Kohala Seminary, and from there my mother sent me to Kamehameha School for girls on Oahu. From there I graduated in 1905, I mean 1904, and went to the Territorial Normal School in Honolulu. I was there for a year, graduated from there in 1905. I went teaching at the Kapalama Public Schools in Hamakua, Hawaii. I taught there for 5 years, and after my husband died I didn't feel so very good to carry on alone. So the doctor advised me to come to Honolulu in 1934, and the session of the legislature was being held, and I attended that legislature.

Representative ANGELL. As a member?

Mrs. REINHARDT. No; just as a visitor. After 2 weeks I returned to Honakaa and went back to my teaching. I stayed there for a month and so the load was too much for me. Then I resigned in June 1943, and from September 1943 up to September 1944 I was on a pension. From that time up to 1945 I was on a pension myself. And when these gentlemen of Hilo, Tribune Herald, and Senator Pedro, learned that

I was out of the teaching profession they asked me to run as a representative for East Hawaii. And from September, October, I got busy, as a politician this time, not as a teacher. I went out campaigning from Waipio Valley to Puna, on East Hawaii. We had our usual Democratic meeting. Then our first outing was from the Volcano House to Kalapana, then to Kukuahali and back again. And in the primary election I was nominated. Over a thousand votes. I was very new in this campaign, politician campaign.

Representative DELANEY. May I inquire, madam, whether you are opposed to statehood? Are you opposed to statehood at this time?

Mrs. REINHARDT. Yes.

Representative DELANEY. And would you be so kind as to tell the committee the reasons for your opposition to statehood?

Mrs. REINHARDT. Why I am against statehood for Hawaii now? I am against statehood for Hawaii now because our house needs a through cleaning. In other words, the Territory of Hawaii needs a good cleaning in every corner of the house, till it is thoroughly clean, before statehood can be considered as statehood. The people and I love our islands. They are beautiful. I also love my Hawaiian people, and also the other races of mankind, understanding that God is a God of love. He created all people. He created the rich and the poor alike. Why are the poor? Because they are lazy. They don't want to war. Why, Jesus' last commandment to His last disciples was, "Love your enemies as thyself."

I think you, the investigating committee, sent by Congress to find out what was done for Hawaii in the past years, and what was done here when the war broke out in December 7, 1941, and war being done at the present time. All of you are getting your idea here now. You are doing wonderful research work. We are glad you came. You are questioning us, and you are learning just as well as we, the people who are here now, and through the medium of the newspapers. We are congratulating Delegate Joseph Farrington for bringing this group of learned men from Washington to investigate the Territory and to hear from some of our civilians why we are against statehood. Congratulations to all of you. You will continue questioning to all departments of education, and find out the truth and facts.

We, the Territory of Hawaii, need a new set-up of legislators, to come to the legislature and get down to business, such as we are seeing you now getting down to business on this statehood hearing. By doing so, the elected representatives and senators from our islands, including Oahu, will be doing good work, and therefore return to their islands after the work and deliver the goods that will mean a benefit to the voters and civilians.

With your going to Molokai, Maui, Kona, and to Hilo on the Big Island, my home town, I'll wish you all a very pleasant trip. I know the people of Kona and Hilo will give you all a good time and good eats. Relax there for a time and say "Aloha" to Madam Pele when you are at the Volcano House. Don't forget her. And do not pick the lehuas while you are going out sightseeing. When you return to the Volcano House, pick the lehuas and say, "We thank you, Madame Pele," and you will not be drenched by the rain. And crossing the Volcano House you will go down to Hilo, my home town on the Big Island, without any rain. Hilo is noted for its liquid

sunshine. That means, when the rain is coming down—well, that's liquid sunshine. But I hope every one of you will enjoy my city of Hilo and the people. I'm sure you will all have a good time.

Chairman TAYLOR. I am sure, Mrs. Reinhardt, we appreciate your experience of good will, but time is going on and I wish you would confine yourself to some remarks as to why you are opposed to statehood at the present time.

Mrs. REINHARDT. We are not ready yet for statehood. We need time to clean up. When I say clean up, well, with a stroke of a broom you cannot sweep a room clean. You have to sweep under the chairs, under the tables, is it not? So, take time, and maybe 1 or 2 years, or 3, or 10 years, we don't know, but after the thorough cleaning, then we will understand. We understand the people here of all races. We are people that God created. There is no difference, man and woman. That's where the difference is. When your work here has ended, please take with you the aloha of the people of Hawaii, and bid your families aloha from us in Hawaii. Will you?

Chairman TAYLOR. Indeed we will. Thank you, Mrs. Reinhardt.

Mrs. REINHARDT. When you reach Washington, D. C., say "aloha" to all the Congressmen, including the President of the United States from the people of Hawaii, and tell President Truman, Mrs. Truman, and their daughter Margaret to come to Hawaii and see for themselves and its people, and—

Chairman TAYLOR. We'll surely do that.

Mrs. REINHARDT. Good luck to you all, and a big aloha from the people of Hawaii, and may God bless and keep you all in the safety zone of good health. Aloha nui, Hattie Saffery, Honolulu, Thursday, June 10, 1946, time 3 minutes past four p. m.

(The witness was excused, and Mr. Theodore Burgess took the chair.)

Mr. BURGESS. I'd like to say at this point that my speech will be in favor, that is, as a proponent of statehood, so if at this point if you gentlemen would like to postpone this—

Chairman TAYLOR. I think under those circumstances we'll wait and hear you at some later date.

Delegate FARRINGTON. There is one witness opposed to statehood, a man who has been consistently opposed, Mr. Maschke. I think if we hear him we can conclude the proceedings in about 10 minutes.

Chairman TAYLOR. We'll hear Mr. Maschke.

(Mr. Burgess leaves and Mr. Maschke takes the chair.)

Mr. CHARLES MASCHKE. My name is Charles Maschke, and I am a carpenter by occupation, a Federal employee for the last 38 years. And I have a pamphlet here of the hearing of 1937, and you will note down here on one of the pages here, page 40, where I opposed statehood; paragraph 77, and I still oppose statehood at this time, for the simple reason we are not ready for it. There has been so much publicity about these Nisei American soldiers that went overseas and came back, of which they done honor to themselves. But I can go down to the history prior to 1945, '41, where they were not any more loyal to the American flag than they were at that time.

Some of the statements were made here yesterday and day before yesterday—I'll give you an illustration of what happened here in the Territory, the election of 1940. There were 12 Japanese-Americans

ran for office. Eleven of them got elected. By the way, they were all Republicans. Eleven got elected to the House and one to the Senate, Mr. Abe. Leaked out during the war in '41 that he was purify American-Japanese set-up. He was arrested by the FBI officials and concentrated, I think, on Sand Island for over a year, and lately released.

Going over to the National Guard set-up, prior to 1940 you had Hawaiians and part Hawaiians, 662; Chinese, 207; Japanese, 40; Portuguese, 322. So you could see from these figures prior to 1941 they didn't show any sign they were going to be loyal to the country. When the war broke out the pressure was so great against them that they had to go and volunteer for the service of the United States Government, to shadow the suspicions that was over their heads. And as far as statehood, I don't see why we should go and decide on statehood now until we can bring the parents of these Nisei soldiers, Japanese, to understand they have got to live under the American flag and the American ways of living, to be faithful to the flag and be honest to the people. That they have never accomplished yet, and until they prove that to you, gentlemen of Congress, then I say consider statehood after that, but not before. Thank you.

Chairman TAYLOR. Any questions, gentlemen?

(No response.)

Chairman TAYLOR. There is one more witness, Mr. Van Valkenburg. Do you want to hear him?

Delegate FARRINGTON. I think we had better.

Chairman TAYLOR. Mr. Van Valkenburg. Will you tell this committee, please, to preface your remarks, something about yourself and your background?

(Mr. Maschke withdraws and Mr. Van Valkenburg takes the chair.)

Mr. A. W. VAN VALKENBURG. I was born in La Crosse, Wis., in 1868, came here, out here, when I was 21. The monarchy was in full swing. I have been here 56 years. I have been in plantation work for a short time, been in railroad work. I have had a good deal of contact with the different races here.

Representative LARCADE. Mr. Chairman, will you ask the witness to speak louder?

Mr. VAN VALKENBURG. I have had a great deal of contact with all the races here, and I have noticed as you grow older—you can see I am 77—I am a little more mellow than I was perhaps some years ago. So I am not going into the racial issue, but as a businessman and an American citizen, I think that we are—I am not for statehood. I think we are better off as we are. If we had statehood we'd have two Senators out of 98, or if Alaska comes in, perhaps out of 100, 2 percent, you know, is nothing. We have been represented in three terms at least by first-class Delegates. I think a Delegate gets more for the representation in Congress than by voting. One of the first things is to get qualified men who would be qualified to act in Congress, and who could afford to go and who could be elected, that's our great difficulty. You know here in our local Legislature, as it is pretty well all over the United States, getting the right kind of people elected, isn't it?

Chairman TAYLOR. You ask a prejudiced person when you ask me. As to who might afford to go is a moot question.

MR. VAN VALKENBURG. Well, it depends upon your salary, I know.

Representative ANGELL. Let me say you have an excellent Delegate in Congress now. You couldn't have a better one.

MR. VAN VALKENBURG. Yes. Sam King was good, and Harry Baldwin, and a former Delegate told me this noon he was assured by the Secretary of the Treasury, somebody, that if we were a State our leprosy expense would be taken care of. I said I would rather pay the increased taxes to support it. Mr. Farrington, I think, can do a great deal more as a Delegate than if he was a Senator. He'd be asked to vote for a measure of one party, and if he did, why then the other party later on would have something. Or he'd have something the other party wouldn't vote, and they'd say you were in with the other bunch. I think he gets a great deal by having no vote. I think the Territory is better off. I may be wrong.

Chairman TAYLOR. Would you be of the same opinion with reference to increased representation? Suppose there was more than one Member of Congress in a reapportionment of this Territory?

MR. VAN VALKENBURG. No; I still think that we are better off as we are. Now we are a ward, and the ward is taken good care of, is being taken good care of. There is a certain feeling of guardianship and one thing and another, and while we do miss out on a few things, possibly, we can feel that we can well afford to miss them as an offset to the privileges we have of being a ward. I voted in Wisconsin before I came out here, 56 years ago, so that—

Chairman TAYLOR. How long do you think this Territorial status should continue?

MR. VAN VALKENBURG. That is the question that could be answered intelligently. I don't mean to be impertinent.

Chairman TAYLOR. Anything more you would care to say?

MR. VAN VALKENBURG. Oh, except one thing. There are many people feel as I do, but for one reason or another they do not come up here. One reason is, knowing nothing will come in Congress any way, why waste your time? So the preponderance of testimony would be in favor of statehood. I don't mean that the preponderance of the people here want statehood.

Chairman TAYLOR. Any questions, gentlemen?

Representative DELANEY. Do you feel that Uncle Sam has been pretty generous in his treatment?

MR. VAN VALKENBURG. Fair. I wouldn't say generous, but fair; that's all anybody should ask for. We have been fair in our taxes. The Big Five and the big corporations have been criticized for their ownership, and one thing and another, but I think if you would call it a monopoly. and some people do, it would be a benevolent monopoly. I have seen some of the things. I could confirm the testimony of some of the people in little things where they have been against the Big Five. I have seen those ills corrected. I know a lot of things were wrong many years ago when I came here. They have been corrected, and we have a very decent set-up.

Representative DELANEY. Would you say there is in existence a group known as the Big Five?

MR. VAN VALKENBURG. There is.

Representative DELANEY. There actually is?

Mr. VAN VALKENBURG. There is. I have known them very well, and have worked with them.

Representative DELANEY. You have worked with them?

Mr. VAN VALKENBURG. They are a very decent sort of—

Representative DELANEY. You do business with them?

Mr. VAN VALKENBURG. Yes.

Representative DELANEY. You have had favorable business relations with them?

Mr. VAN VALKENBURG. Sometimes, and sometimes they haven't been so favorable. Everybody makes mistakes.

Representative DELANEY. You said they are a benevolent group?

Mr. VAN VALKENBURG. I would say, if you call them a benevolent group—I don't like the word monopoly.

Representative DELANEY. But you say it is a monopoly?

Mr. VAN VALKENBURG. I didn't—pardon me—I say it has been referred to as a monopoly.

Representative DELANEY. Didn't you say it is a benevolent monopoly?

Mr. VAN VALKENBURG. I'd say if you call it a monopoly, you'd call it a benevolent monopoly.

Representative DELANEY. That's all.

Representative MILLER. The fact that is a monopoly is qualified by the word "benevolent"; is that correct?

Mr. VAN VALKENBURG. I didn't say it was a monopoly.

Representative MILLER. You said it was.

Mr. VAN VALKENBURG. No; I said it was, if it was a monopoly, it could be called benevolent.

Representative MILLER. But it is a monopoly qualified by the word "benevolent," and therefore the benevolency can be changed at any time to an oppressive monopoly?

Mr. VAN VALKENBURG. But it can't under the American system.

Representative MILLER. Oh, it has been.

Mr. VAN VALKENBURG. We didn't have the American system when I came here.

Representative DELANEY. What were you saying about the Matson Line?

Mr. VAN VALKENBURG. The Matson Line was accused this morning of wanting to keep the small farmer down, so they could carry a pitiful amount of refrigerator goods in lettuce and asparagus and stuff like that. That's all tommy-rot. I have farmed land myself. The tenants are paying no rent. One fellow will take off one season a thousand head of lettuce, and the next two crops—

Representative DELANEY. Do you do any business with the Matson Line?

Mr. VAN VALKENBURG. Very little.

Representative DELANEY. You do some business?

Mr. VAN VALKENBURG. Yes.

Representative DELANEY. And in that instance would you say they were benevolent?

Mr. VAN VALKENBURG. No; but they are fair. They are fair now; they weren't always.

Representative DELANEY. That's all.

Chairman TAYLOR. I think at this time we will suspend until 10 o'clock Tuesday morning, January 15, if that is agreeable to the committee.

(The committee at this point adjourned at 4:20 p. m., January 10, 1946, to reconvene at 10 o'clock a. m., January 15, 1946, in Iolani Palace, Honolulu, T. H.)

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII

FRIDAY, JANUARY 11, 1946

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE TERRITORIES,
Wailuku, Maui, T. H.

The committee met at 3:20 p. m., Hon. Henry D. Larcade (chairman) presiding.

Present: Representative Henry D. Larcade, Louisiana, chairman; Representative James J. Delaney, New York, member; Representative George P. Miller, California, member; Representative Dean P. Taylor, New York, member; Representative Homer D. Angell, Oregon, member; Delegate Joseph R. Farrington, member; Irwin W. Silverman, Esq., chief counsel for House Territories Subcommittee; C. Nils Tavares, Esq., attorney general, Hawaii; Dudley C. Lewis, Esq., deputy attorney general, Hawaii.

Chairman LARCADE. Aloha, citizens of Maui. This is a committee appointed by the Committee on Territories of the House of Representatives of the United States, under authority of a resolution passed by the House of Representatives on April 30, 1945, authorizing this committee as a subcommittee of the Committee on Territories to visit Hawaii for the purpose of investigating the question of the legislation pending before the Congress of the United States, most of which is that pertaining to the question of statehood for the Territory of Hawaii. Other important legislation is also pending, and in view of the fact that a committee has not visited the Territory for the last 8 years, and further action has been suspended on the previous legislation for the purpose of admitting Hawaii into the United States as a member of our great Nation, immediately upon termination of the war, your Delegate in Congress immediately interested himself in that respect, and I want to say that it is due largely to the efforts of Mr. Farrington that this delegation was authorized by the Congress and was prevailed upon to make this visit at this time. However, as you know, we have been in almost continuous session in Congress all during the period of the war, and have very little time to visit our own districts, and to meet our own constituents, and consider their problems.

We have recessed from the 21st of December, and while we had an opportunity to go home for a few days, most of us really should have gone over to our districts, to have mingled with our own constituents. As you know, Congress is going to reassemble on the 14th of January, and at that time there is much legislation, most important legislation, that has to be considered by the Congress, and while we would like to remain here longer, we will have to return to Washington at the earliest possible moment.

However, at the request of Mr. Farrington, we have made an extra effort to visit you, and we hope to visit all the rest of the islands in the Territory.

At this time it gives me great pleasure to present to you the other members of our delegation. First I want to present to you Mr. James Delaney, Representative from the State of New York, a Democrat. [Applause.] I next desire to present to you Mr. Miller, from California, another Democrat. [Applause.] I also wish to state that your speaker, Henry Larcade, Jr., is a Congressman of the State of Louisiana. [Applause.]

We also have some Republicans on this committee, and it is now my pleasure to present to you the Republican ranking member of the Committee on Territories, the Honorable Homer Angell, of Oregon. [Applause.] And from the great State of New York Mr. Taylor. [Applause.]

The next gentleman that I am about to present to you, I know, needs no introduction, because he has served you well and faithfully, and as I have said previously, it is largely due to his insistence and through his efforts that this committee was persuaded to make this visit, and at this time I will not attempt to introduce or eulogize Delegate Farrington, because I know all of you know him very well, and it is not necessary for me to do that, so I simply present to you your Delegate from Hawaii, the Honorable Joseph Farrington.

Delegate FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, at the time I made the request that the Committee on Territories send a subcommittee to Hawaii to inform itself of general conditions in the islands, I had in mind particularly the desirability of offering an opportunity to local people to present their point of view on some of the legislation pending before the committee. Among those measures there are two bills relating to the land laws whose enactment was requested by action of the Territorial Legislature. The first bill was presented by myself following the adjournment of the legislature, and it is H. R. 3656. It is the last measure that was presented to the house by your own Representative Reuben Goodness, and amends the Hawaiian Homes Commissions Act so as to make available a parcel of Government land in the district of Wailuku for settlement under the provisions of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act.

The particular purpose for giving Mr. Goodness the opportunity to be heard on this measure is that the Department of the Interior, I understand, has recommended against its enactment on the strength of a letter it has received from the Territorial land commissioner. The point of view of the land commissioner seems to be that inasmuch as this is sugar land, to open it to settlement under the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act would be contrary to a principle that has prevailed since the Hawaiian Homes Act was originally adopted.

I am going to ask Mr. Goodness to make a brief statement on behalf of the bill, if he cares to do so, and before I present him I want to say that following that I will present the bill that was introduced originally in the Territorial legislature by your Senator Crozier, and was in turn presented to Congress by myself, and is also pending before the Committee on Territories, and in that case also, the Interior Department, on the recommendation of the land commissioner, recom-

mended adversely. I felt that both of these gentlemen should have this opportunity to make a brief statement.

Now, following their statements, the committee is here to take testimony on the bill to authorize the process by which Hawaii would qualify for statehood. As you know, the committee has been sitting in Honolulu for several days, at hearings designed to fully acquaint them with all aspects of this problem. It has heard a great deal of testimony and covered most of the ground. I think, however, that the committee will be glad to hear anyone here who desires to make a brief statement. I say "brief" because the time is limited. I think I can assure you that the committee will be very happy to receive any statement in writing that anyone cares to make and that can be incorporated in the permanent record. I ask the chairman to let me make that statement.

Chairman LARCADE. That is perfectly all right.

Delegate FARRINGTON. This is a preliminary statement by way of expediting the proceedings for him, and with that I will conclude by requesting that those who appear on these two bills make their statements as concise and brief as possible, and that those who desire to express themselves on the subject of statehood rise and ask for recognition, keeping in mind that the time we have is very brief, and also that you will have ample opportunity later to submit a written statement.

With those remarks, Mr. Chairman, I suggest that the committee hear Representative Goodness on H. R. 3656.

Mr. REUBEN GOODNESS. My name is Reuben Goodness, and I am from the Third District of the Territory, the Territorial legislature.

Chairman LARCADE. Will you proceed with your statement, please?

Mr. GOODNESS. As the introducer of House Resolution 3656, introduced by our Delegate to Congress at the Seventy-Ninth Congress, I, as a Representative from the Third District, feel, in introducing this bill, that this measure is a measure that should go through. In asking Congress to amend the organic act, under the Hawaiian Organic Act of July 9, 1921, I contend that the Hawaiians, especially a lot of them who are working for the county, have to come all the way from the outlying districts, from Kahakuloa, where they are living, and they are all scattered here and there, and they have to come all the way to Wailuku, and so I feel in asking Congress to amend the organic act, and as it applies to the Hawaiian Homes Commission, I feel under that that it would be fully qualified, under the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, and the place being close for transportation, in going to and from work, I feel that that should go through. Now in asking for this 12,455 acres of land, under the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, I have talked to Mr. Julian Yates, and he felt that if Congress will approve of it, it would take about 120 Hawaiians on this project, and he feels that it is a worth-while project, and he feels that it is one that should go through. This is not the only one in the Territory. I think there is another area in Hawaii called Keokaha House Lots, which has a bigger area, but since this is 12,455 acres, which is the only suitable land, I feel it should be obtained so that the Hawaiians can come further in, and closer to town, in respect to their work, and that this is the ideal place for it.

I am not asking Congress to amend all our land laws, but I am just asking Congress to amend this certain portion, as to land owned by the Territory, which is in sugar now.

Chairman LARCADE. Mr. Farrington, in view of the fact that this is a matter with which you are quite familiar, I was wondering if you would not want to interrogate the witness and deal with this particular field.

Delegate FARRINGTON. I will do that, Mr. Chairman. The land that is referred to in this legislation is at present owned by the Territory?

Mr. GOODNESS. Yes, sir.

Delegate FARRINGTON. And it is owned by the Territory but leased to the Wailuku Sugar Co.?

Mr. GOODNESS. Yes, sir; it is.

Delegate FARRINGTON. It is on the waterfront, is it not?

Mr. GOODNESS. No; it is more inland.

Delegate FARRINGTON. I see. Are there any house lots available to persons who qualify under the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act on the island of Maui at the present time?

Mr. GOODNESS. Yes, sir.

Delegate FARRINGTON. Where are they?

Mr. GOODNESS. There are a lot of them in Kahakuloa; and quite a lot of them do not own house lots.

Delegate FARRINGTON. There are some house lots available on the island of Maui, are there? Do you know whether they are all occupied; those under the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act.

Mr. GOODNESS. No, sir; there are none.

Delegate FARRINGTON. In other words, on the island of Maui there is no land coming under the jurisdiction of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act that has been opened up for house lots?

Mr. GOODNESS. Not that I know of.

Delegate FARRINGTON. How many people are there on Maui who would qualify by reason of their being 50 percent Hawaiian blood, for those lots?

Mr. GOODNESS. I believe there are quite a number of them.

Delegate FARRINGTON. Would you say there were over 500; from 500 to a thousand?

Mr. GOODNESS. There are, I think, over 500.

Delegate FARRINGTON. And you presumably feel that there is quite a demand for these lots?

Mr. GOODNESS. Yes, sir.

Delegate FARRINGTON. You said that Julian Yates favored this legislation?

Mr. GOODNESS. Yes, sir.

Delegate FARRINGTON. And he is the executive secretary of the Hawaiian Homes Commission under the act?

Mr. GOODNESS. Yes, sir.

Delegate FARRINGTON. Do you know whether his attitude had the full approval of the Hawaiian Homes Commission?

Mr. GOODNESS. That I did not ask him about.

Delegate FARRINGTON. Presumably it did, however. Was this recommended by a general resolution or otherwise?

Mr. GOODNESS. I introduced it first in 1943, for an exchange with the plantation, and at the time after I introduced it it passed both houses, and was signed by the Governor, and when the exchange came through I was not satisfied with the exchange, so I asked for a hold-up

of it, and when I was elected this last time I went down here, and that is how I introduced this bill, asking Congress to amend the organic act.

Delegate FARRINGTON. I see. Under your original plan you anticipated that the Territory, within the opportunity it had, under its authority, could make this land available by exchanging this land for some other land?

Mr. GOODNESS. Yes.

Delegate FARRINGTON. The Legislature acted favorably on that proposal?

Mr. GOODNESS. Yes.

Delegate FARRINGTON. But the Territorial administration failed to carry it out?

Mr. GOODNESS. No, not the Territorial administration, but under the exchange that the Territory wanted to carry through I was not satisfied with it, because in that exchange the corporation wanted too much for good, valuable land.

Delegate FARRINGTON. So that you introduced this proposal, that did not involve the matter of exchanging land, but would take a part of the sugar lands and place them within the jurisdiction of the Hawaiian Homes Commission lands?

Mr. GOODNESS. Yes, for taking that small portion I had asked for.

Delegate FARRINGTON. There are no Hawaiian Homes' settlements on the island of Maui at the present time?

Mr. GOODNESS. Not that I know of.

Delegate FARRINGTON. The settlements in Maui County are all on the island of Molokai, which we will see on our visit there tomorrow?

Mr. GOODNESS. Yes, sir.

Delegate FARRINGTON. The Attorney General suggests two more questions that might clarify the facts under this bill. How far is Kahakuloa from Wailuku?

Mr. GOODNESS. It is about 17 miles; 15 to 17 miles.

Delegate FARRINGTON. And this land is at Kahakuloa, is it not? And the land you want to obtain is at Wailuku?

Mr. GOODNESS. It is about $3\frac{1}{2}$ to 4 miles from Wailuku. It is right on the main highway.

Delegate FARRINGTON. In other words, at the present time even to go to Kahakuloa from Wailuku involves a trip of 16 miles?

Mr. GOODNESS. Yes, 16 to 17 miles.

Delegate FARRINGTON. And obtaining this land would provide them ground that is within 3 or 4 miles of Wailuku?

Mr. GOODNESS. Yes, sir.

Delegate FARRINGTON. That is the point of this thing?

Mr. GOODNESS. Yes, sir.

Delegate FARRINGTON. This Kahakuloa Road is in what kind of condition?

Mr. GOODNESS. The roads are in deplorable condition.

Delegate FARRINGTON. I think that clarifies the basic part of the bill, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman LARCADE. I was just wondering if it would not be a good idea to read the bill, so that the committee would have a better understanding of it.

Delegate FARRINGTON. Yes.

(Mr. Goodness reads bill:)

[H. R. 3656, 79th Cong., 1st sess.]

A BILL To amend section 203 of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, designating certain public lands as available home lands

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 203 of title II of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act of July 9, 1921 (42 Stat. 109; 48 U. S. C. 697), as amended, designating certain public lands as available home lands, is further amended by adding thereto the following:

"Wailuku, Maui: That parcel of Government land, situate in the District of Wailuku, island and county of Maui, comprising twelve and four hundred and fifty-five thousandths acres of the Ii of Kou and being a portion of the land covered by General Lease Numbered 2286 to Wailuku Sugar Company, Limited, subject, however, to the terms of said lease."

Chairman LARCADE. Any questions by any members of the Committee?

Representative DELANEY. During your testimony, sir, you mentioned that this land should be opened up to the Hawaiians. Will you explain this; just whom you mean by "Hawaiians"?

Mr. GOODNESS. I mean, those under the Hawaiian Homes Act.

Representative DELANEY. Is this land to be opened up to all citizens of the Territory?

Mr. GOODNESS. No, sir; all those that are qualified under the Hawaiian Homes Act.

Representative DELANEY. Will you state briefly the qualifications for us, under this Hawaiian Homes Land Act?

Mr. GOODNESS. At least you ought to have 50 percent Hawaiian blood.

Representative DELANEY. Don't you consider that this is discriminatory, as against the citizens of this Territory?

Mr. GOODNESS. No, sir; I do not.

Representative DELANEY. You do not so consider it?

Mr. GOODNESS. No, sir.

Representative DELANEY. Don't you feel that this gives special privileges to one particular group?

Mr. GOODNESS. Heretofore when they gave the Hawaiians property they gave them away out in an unknown place, where they have no roads, and they have to contend with water problems—

Representative DELANEY. I am not questioning you now as to what happened in the past. My point to you is whether or not this land should be opened up to all citizens of the Territory? Do you favor the principle that they must have a percentage of Hawaiian blood in order to be eligible to purchase or go upon this land?

Mr. GOODNESS. According to this I notice it is, and I introduced it, under the Hawaiian Homes Act, and as far as the other goes, why I had another bill introduced, but it did not go through.

Representative DELANEY. Well, don't you feel that this land should be opened to all the citizens of the Territory?

Mr. GOODNESS. Well, at the time I introduced it I had just one purpose.

Delegate FARRINGTON. If I may say something by way of explanation?

Chairman LARCADE. Yes.

Delegate FARRINGTON. In 1920 or 1921 Congress set aside some 200,000 acres of Government land for settlement by the native people. The purpose of this legislation was to bring about their rehabilitation. It was the result of the belief that by this method the disintegration of the native people could be stopped, and that the native people could be reestablished on the land and restored to a condition of health and prosperity, such as they had enjoyed in the past. It is not the purpose of this bill to change that policy. He merely proposes that this little tract of land be covered within the scope of this particular bill.

Representative DELANEY. Yes, I am very familiar with that, but let me ask this further question. Is there a shortage of land for home sites in this community?

Mr. GOODNESS. Sure; plenty. There is a shortage.

Representative DELANEY. Then all the citizens of the community need relief, is that right?

Mr. GOODNESS. Yes, sir.

Representative DELANEY. Well, don't you feel that a bill to condemn certain property by the Government and enabling all citizens to purchase would be a more fair and equitable bill?

Mr. GOODNESS. Well, that is up to somebody else to introduce it.

Representative DELANEY. Is there anything, as far as you know, being done, or has anything been done to relieve the other citizens of the community?

Mr. GOODNESS. No, sir.

Representative DELANEY. It is only for those who qualify under the Hawaiian Homes Act?

Mr. GOODNESS. Yes, sir.

Representative DELANEY. That is all.

Representative MILLER. Mr. Chairman?

Chairman LARCADE. Mr. Miller.

Representative MILLER. I would like to direct this question to either Mr. Farrington or the Attorney General, as I think they are better qualified to answer. Is this qualification of 50 percent Hawaiian blood in order to qualify an Act of Congress, set up by an Act of Congress, or where does it originate?

Mr. TAVARES. It is an Act of Congress. That is, in order to change that or revise the present scope of the Act would not be by representatives from Hawaii, but it would rest upon Congress.

Delegate FARRINGTON. That's true.

Representative MILLER. Is this land presently rented, do you know?

Mr. GOODNESS. Yes.

Mr. TAVARES. It is under lease to the Wailuku Sugar Company. I think it will be up at, maybe, the end of two or three years.

Representative MILLER. What is the present rental of the land; what amount?

Mr. TAVARES. I have no idea.

Representative MILLER. This amounts to about 12½ acres, and that is all the amount of land that is involved?

Mr. TAVARES. Yes, sir.

Mr. GOODNESS. If the law is modified, and this is authorized, the land can be secured, but as the land is presently in sugar, and is sugar land,

as such it cannot be included or opened for settlement under the Hawaiian Homes Act.

Representative MILLER. If this is modified, though, will it relieve the present housing shortage by letting people who qualify under the law to move onto this tract and perhaps open up other housing facilities either here or elsewhere?

Mr. GOODNESS. Yes, sir.

Representative MILLER. That is, on the island generally, which could be occupied by other families?

Mr. GOODNESS. Yes, sir.

Representative MILLER. Is there a shortage of housing in other places besides Wailuku, on the island, at present?

Mr. GOODNESS. Yes; in fact on the whole island.

Representative MILLER. The whole island?

Mr. GOODNESS. Yes.

Representative DELANEY. I would like to ask the attorney general one question: Will you explain to me who passes on the qualifications?

Mr. TAVARES. For land under the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act?

Representative DELANEY. Yes, that's right.

Mr. TAVARES. The act creates an Hawaiian Homes Commission, composed of a number of members; I think it is five, appointed by the Governor, with the approval of the Territorial Senate, who pass upon the qualifications of applicants and make the determination, which includes among other things, not only whether they are qualified by race, but whether they are qualified by other qualities, to be placed on the land. In other words, the likelihood of success is one of the things which they have to pass on before they place people on the Hawaiian Homes Commission lands under lease, or, as it is called, a 99-year lease.

Representative DELANEY. Suppose I represented myself as an applicant under this act, and I appeared before you and stated that I was qualified; that I had 50 percent Hawaiian blood, and the board determined that I did not, or refused to grant me an application, what would be the procedure from there on?

Mr. TAVARES. If you had any recourse at all it would be by going into the court and perhaps mandamusing the Commission, but I doubt very much if a court would proceed with a finding of fact unless they were of the opinion from the known and admitted facts that it was an arbitrary abuse of discretion.

Representative DELANEY. You will agree that that leaves a lot of latitude to the members sitting on that commission?

Mr. TAVARES. No more than any judge has, in ruling on any questions of fact. It is the assumption that a judge, the same as any public officials, in the main acts honestly. I believe that is a presumption we have to rely on in all democratic processes.

Representative DELANEY. You will agree with me that it does give a tremendous latitude to the men who have the right to pass on this?

Mr. TAVARES. That is correct.

Representative MILLER. May I say, by way of an observation, that you have precedent for this. The act has tried to take care of these aborigines. The Indians, under certain conditions, have certain rights, and the same chance has been given to them.

Representative DELANEY. I thank the gentleman for his observation. I am very well acquainted, Mr. Miller, with that; thank you.

Representative MILLER. I would like to say, also, that the power to reclaim those people along the same lines with these other people would be justified.

Chairman LARCADE. Mr. Taylor is recognized.

Representative TAYLOR. I am anxious to know how this commission is composed. Is there among the membership any man who is 50 percent Hawaiian blood?

Mr. TAVARES. Yes. If I remember accurately the act requires that at least one or more of the members must be of the same qualification as the persons eligible to participate in the benefits of the act.

Representative ANGELL. In my State of Oregon, and particularly in the West, there are large tracts of land which have been set aside by the Federal Government for the original inhabitants of that territory, when it was a Territory. I happen to have had some experience working on some of those lands where they were allotted to these tribes, and they had to, of course, prove that they belonged to the tribe in order to secure an allotment for those lands. Is not this procedure here akin to that program that we followed in the West?

Mr. TAVARES. Yes, I believe it is.

Representative ANGELL. The purpose of it is, of course, to provide homesteads and land for the original inhabitants of the Territory; isn't that right?

Mr. TAVARES. That is correct.

Chairman LARCADE. Any other questions?

Delegate FARRINGTON. I think that completes his statement.

Chairman LARCADE. Do you have anything to add to what you have testified in view of the colloquy that you have just heard? Would you have anything further to say?

Mr. GOODNESS. No, sir.

Chairman LARCADE. May I ask you one question, which departs from the particular subject under consideration, and in view of the fact that this committee is here primarily for the purpose of looking into the question of statehood. I know that this is the Third District, and that there were 10,198 votes cast, of which 66.7 percent were in favor of statehood and 27.31 percent opposed. I would like to ask you, sir, if you are in favor of statehood for the Territory?

Mr. GOODNESS. Well, Mr. Chairman, I voted for statehood at the last session.

Chairman LARCADE. Would you have anything to add in that respect; any statement you would like to make as to why you believe the Territory should be granted statehood?

Mr. GOODNESS. No, sir.

Chairman LARCADE. Thank you very much.

Is there anyone present who would like to testify for or against this bill that has just been read here? Is there anyone in the audience; any citizen, who wishes to testify on this bill? If not, we will proceed with the next.

We will now take up House Resolution No. 3654, introduced by Mr. Farrington, which will be discussed by Mr. Crozier.

Mr. CLARENCE CROZIER. My name is Clarence Crozier. I am a senator from the Second District.

Chairman LARCADE. What is your business?

Mr. CROZIER. I am a rancher.

Chairman LARCADE. Now, before you proceed, Mr. Crozier, in order that the committee may be able to consider this bill, I would like to have you read it for them. Will you please do that?

Mr. CROZIER [reading]:

[H. R. 3654, 79th Cong., 1st sess. H. R. 3361 similar]

A BILL To amend section 73 of the Organic Act of Hawaii, relating to opening of agricultural lands for settlement

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 73 of the organic act of Hawaii (31 Stat. 154; 48 U. S. C. 674), as amended, is further amended by adding the following paragraphs:

"Whenever twenty-five or more persons, who are disabled veterans holding an honorable discharge from service during World War II, in the armed forces of the United States, or in the merchant marine of the United States, or who are widows of members of said forces or merchant marine who have died in such service, and all of whom have been residents of Hawaii for a continuous period of not less than five years immediately prior to their entry into such service, and who have not theretofore made application under this section, shall make written application to the Commissioner of Public Lands for the opening of lands for settlement in any locality or district, it shall be the duty of the Commissioner to proceed expeditiously to survey and open for entry lands, whether unoccupied or under lease with the right of withdrawal, sufficient in area to provide lands of not more than one acre each for use and occupancy upon ninety-nine-year lease by such persons, together with all persons of like qualification who shall have filed with the Commissioner, prior to the survey of such lands, written application for lands for occupancy in the district designated in said application. The lands to be so opened by the Commissioner shall be either the specific tract or tracts applied for or other suitable and available lands in the same geographical district, and, as far as possible, in the immediate locality of and as nearly equal to that applied for as may be available: *Provided, however*, That no leased land under cultivation shall be taken for such purposes until any growing crops thereon have been harvested: *And provided further*, That such lease made hereunder shall be subject to the following conditions whether or not expressly stipulated in the lease:

"(1) The lessee shall pay a rental of \$1 a year for the land and the lease shall be for a term of ninety-nine years.

"(2) The lessee shall occupy and commence to use or cultivate the land as his home or farm within one year after the lease is made, and shall continuously so use and cultivate said land during the entire term of the lease.

"(3) The lessee shall not in any manner transfer to, mortgage, pledge, or otherwise hold for the benefit of any other person, or agree so to transfer, mortgage, pledge, or otherwise hold, his interest in the land, except to a person qualified to be an original lessee. Such interest shall not be subject to attachment, levy, or sale upon court process. Upon the death of the lessee his interest in the land and improvements thereon shall vest as follows:

"(a) In the surviving spouse, if there be such.

"(b) If there be no surviving spouse, in such child or children as he may designate by will, or upon failure of such designation, in his children in joint tenancy.

"(c) In the event that he leave no spouse or children, the right to the use and occupancy of said land shall thereupon revert in the Territory.

"(4) The lessee shall pay all taxes assessed upon the land and improvements thereon, and if he fails to pay the same, within sixty days after they become delinquent, the land commissioner may thereupon pay the taxes and declare the lease upon same to be forfeited and canceled, and evict the lessee therefrom.

"Upon failure to comply with any of said conditions the lease shall be forfeited and canceled and the right to the use and occupancy of said land shall thereupon revert in the Territory and the land commissioner may take possession of the same and of all improvements thereon.

"Upon the death of a lessee leaving no spouse or children, or upon the cancellation or surrender of a lease, the commissioner of public lands shall appraise the value of all improvements and growing crops upon the leasehold and shall pay

to the legal representative of the deceased lessee, or to the lessee, if he be living, the value thereof, less any indebtedness to any Government agency or secured by any Government agency, or for taxes, and the Territory of Hawaii shall make provision for such payment;”

Chairman LARCADE. Now, Mr. Crozier, you may make your statement with respect to this bill.

Mr. CROZIER. Under the organic act, section 73, any 25 persons can get together and petition the land commissioner to open up homesteads, and on these homesteads, if there is a plant crop, you have to give them the privilege to remove the plant crop. This bill here was an act to amend it to add that veterans could get together, 25 veterans could get together, disabled veterans, and get a little house lot for themselves. This other way, if they get together, and the way the organic act is now, 25 citizens can get together and petition for homesteads, and this would be the addition: That is, that 25 veterans could get together and apply for 1 acre lots, and as they get old, as the veterans get old, they become old cronies, and they like to sit around there and talk about the war and how they won it, and how many they killed and how many they did not kill; and it is no more than fair that we do something for our boys. If it was not for our boys at the beginning of the war probably the Japanese flag would be flying here today. Our boys went out and stuck it out, and 1 acre of land that is asked for a house lot doesn't hurt the Territory, and the Territory has the land available—or plenty of land.

This bill was a concurrent resolution, and it was introduced by myself. The original one was for a 4-acre site, and as the 4-acre site was discussed through the legislature we managed to get it out at one acre.

The land commissioner did not come out, and was not man enough to come out there and oppose me there. He sneaked around and wrote to Washington, and killed the bill. Our Delegate received the concurrent resolution in good faith and presented it, and voted for it, but when he came out he found there was a little sticker over on the side, saying that he was not to give it, that the Territory did not want it. So, gentlemen, that is the whole picture on the bill.

Representative TAYLOR. Why didn't you ask for 100 acres, and maybe you would get one-tenth of that. [Laughter.]

Chairman LARCADE. Mr. Farrington.

Delegate FARRINGTON. I would like to ask the attorney general for the Territory to make a statement clarifying the law involved in this particular amendment. Will you do that?

Mr. TAVARES. It is my understanding that this bill does substantially what Mr. Crozier stated it would. It limits the class of persons who can apply for homesteads, or which really amount to house lots rather than homesteads; 1-acre house lots, to disabled veterans holding honorable discharges from the services during World War II, and to those who have lived in Hawaii for more than 5 years, prior to their entry into the service. That is the class of veterans who would be eligible to apply for these house lots. I don't know exactly what the question was.

Delegate FARRINGTON. What I wanted you to do is to clarify this: Beyond honorably discharged, disabled veterans being qualified to have these lands, does it alter any of the present restrictions covering the opening of public lands for homesteading sites, or house lot sites?

Mr. TAVARES. Mr. Chairman, I would like to reserve my reply. May I reserve the answer to that question to a little later in the hearing. I would like to reread the Organic Act so that I won't give you any inaccurate information.

Chairman LARCADE. We would be very glad to have you reply to that question at a future time, Mr. Tavares.

Are there any other questions?

Representative DELANEY. This act is primarily to relieve disabled veterans, is that right?

Mr. CROZIER. Originally, when I——

Representative DELANEY. Just answer yes or no, and I think we will get along. You said, I believe, you are a practical man, with a great deal of experience in politics. Do you expect the Members of Congress to vote for this bill and discriminate against our disabled veterans in the States? May I put the question like this: This bill does discriminate against the veterans who were disabled who happen to live in the States, is that right?

Mr. CROZIER. No. This is supposed to take care of our local boys.

Representative DELANEY. But you put a 5-year qualification on it; that a man must be a resident for 5 years prior to his entry into the armed services?

Mr. CROZIER. He must. But most States have a similar program for relief, and in view of what is being done by the different States I think it is no more than fair that we should not throw it wide open, or we would not have enough land for everybody.

Representative DELANEY. We are talking about disabled veterans now. It is true, possibly, that disabled veterans from all sections of the mainland might need this warm climate in order to live. Don't you feel that in this particular case it is discriminatory, as against the veterans on the mainland who desire to come here and have the benefits of this climate?

Mr. CROZIER. As to the climatic conditions, we have nothing to do with that. [Laughter.]

Representative ANGELL. God fixed that up for you. [Applause.]

Chairman LARCADE. Let's have order, please. You may proceed, Mr. Delaney.

Representative DELANEY. Is it not true that for a great number of our disabled veterans—men who fought for our country, and defended Hawaii, that came from the mainland, and many of them gave their lives, and others gave their limbs—and many who were brought here to recover, under this particular act cannot take advantage of your proposal, or your bill, is that right?

Mr. CROZIER. You are right; under the Territorial laws they cannot, and under section 73, I think it is, of the organic act. They have to be a citizen of Hawaii before they can apply.

Representative DELANEY. Do you expect the Members of Congress, who are made up of men from the mainland, to pass such a bill? Do you feel that they could in any good conscience vote for such a proposition?

Mr. CROZIER. I do not see why not, because each State is going to do something for their returning veterans. Each State is going to do something special for their own men.

Representative DELANEY. But this is class legislation, is it not?

Mr. CROZIER. Well, the other States are doing something special for their veterans, and that is class legislation as well. The only thing is that we, being a Territory, have to go to Congress to ask approval for it. If we had statehood we would not have to do that. [Laughter.]

Representative DELANEY. I presume you are in favor of statehood?

Mr. CROZIER. Yes.

Representative DELANEY. The very reason that this committee is here. Now in the event that you were admitted to statehood you would give such special privileges to those who happened to be residents of the Territory prior to the admission to statehood?

Mr. CROZIER. No; I would not say that.

Representative DELANEY. Now, if I go from New York, and I happen to be a resident of New York—if I go to Pennsylvania and become a resident there. I am entitled to all the privileges of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. You put in a period of time, an arbitrary period of time, 5 years. Doesn't that take care of a select group?

Mr. CROZIER. Well, there had to be some time limit on it.

Representative DELANEY. That's right.

Mr. CROZIER. It is just like being a citizen of the United States. You have to be here so long in this country before you have the privilege of becoming a citizen.

Representative DELANEY. That's right. I understand.

Representative TAYLOR. There is one thing I don't quite get, Senator. On the one hand you have a bill that takes care of their welfare, and gives them a piece of land, and on the other hand you have a bill for veterans. Why doesn't somebody become a good politician and give everybody on the islands a chance at these privileges?

Mr. CROZIER. There is something in the organic act as to qualifications for opening homesteads.

Representative TAYLOR. What is the present status of that?

Mr. CROZIER. The present status of that is that whenever we want to amend it we have to put through a petition, and there is always some mix-up and the bill does not go through. When we opened up that piece in the district of Kahakuloa it took me 6 years to open up one site of homesteads. As you know yourselves, the land is limited, and there is always a battle if the land is going to be divided up. To answer the question, the only thing I am trying to do is add one more section to that, to take care of the disabled veterans, and this other one, to open up homesteads, that is supposed to stay the same. Section 75, I think it is, of the organic act, I do not want to change that, but this one is only so that the disabled veterans can pile up in one little place and sit down and talk over those war days.

Representative MILLER. Senator, have you given any thought to the definition of disabled veterans?

Mr. CROZIER. Well—

Representative MILLER. In other words, it is very broad now. What constitutes a disabled veteran? I may say that in, for instance, the California law, that is similar to this one, it is limited entirely to people who lived in California a certain time—enlisted in California—it is called the California Army and Navy Aid Act, and disabled veterans are given a preference, but the law defines a disabled veteran as one who has received a certificate of disability of more than 10 percent, from the United States Veterans' Administration, which ties the

disability directly to the war, the war service, and making it as a result of the war service. I just wondered whether you have anything in there about that proposition, or if you have given it any thought, of being very particular to have it definite. In other words, if it just says that anyone who is disabled could place himself under the act, it makes it very hard for the local authorities to determine who is covered. They have to practically make some differentiation of the veterans, and the Veterans' Administration makes rules under the law, and a disabled veteran has a certificate which he sends to the Veterans' Administration, and he makes it out, and which goes from 10 percent disability, and that comes back, and it gives him a preference against other veterans.

Mr. CROZIER. That is practically the same standard as is proposed in most of the States.

Representative MILLER. It is practically the same, I think, in most of the States, whether it is a bonus such as certain States pay to those people who enlisted and were citizens of the State, or who had resided in the State for a certain time before they entered the service, as they did after the last war, or some other thing.

Mr. CROZIER. And I believe that we are going to get statehood, and then we will come right along with them, and fall in line.

Representative MILLER. I just wanted to call your attention to that one section of the law that is now very broad.

Delegate FARRINGTON. I would like to ask Senator Crozier a few questions about the status of our public lands.

Chairman LARCADE. Proceed.

Delegate FARRINGTON. Isn't it true that when Hawaii was admitted into the United States we ceded our public lands to the Federal Government—quite a few of our public lands to the Federal Government; for so long as we remained a Territory, they would remain in the Federal Government?

Mr. CROZIER. Yes.

Delegate FARRINGTON. And if it were a State it would be unnecessary that you carry such a request to Congress?

Mr. CROZIER. Yes, sir.

Delegate FARRINGTON. And isn't it true also that these public lands are the property of the citizens of this Territory?

Mr. CROZIER. That's true.

Delegate FARRINGTON. And the people of the Territory are entitled to their administration in a manner that is in the best interests of the people of the Territory?

Mr. CROZIER. Yes.

Delegate FARRINGTON. Isn't it true, also, that anyone can qualify as a citizen of the Territory after 1 year of residence—and many thousands of people have done so, and that, in fact, we have encouraged a large number of people to become residents and establish themselves in the islands?

Mr. CROZIER. Yes.

Delegate FARRINGTON. And isn't it true, also, that during the period of the war when we imported a large number of people from the mainland they raised a great hue and cry against paying any taxes to the Territory, regardless of the great cost their presence in the islands involved?

Mr. CROZIER. That is very true.

Chairman LARCADE. Are there any further questions?

Representative ANGELL. Isn't it true that these lands, when the Territory was admitted, became the property of the Federal Government?

Delegate FARRINGTON. That's right.

Representative ANGELL. And if it is granted statehood they will still remain—that is, the title will still remain in the Federal Government?

Delegate FARRINGTON. That is a question, Mr. Angell.

Representative ANGELL. Of Course Texas came in and she reserved her land, but Texas was an independent country, but my Territory, for instance, Oregon, and all the Territories in the West ceded their lands to the Federal Government, and they belong in fee simple title to the Federal Government, and the Federal Government had control of it, but it is a question I presume of what Congress would do, and as to what the Territory itself might request as to whether the title would remain in the Territory or in the Federal Government in the case of statehood.

Mr. TAVARES. I should like to call particular attention to the joint resolution of annexation by which Hawaii was actually taken into the Government, and in one of the paragraphs of that resolution—and this was made, mind you, at the inception, at the time it came into the Union. This is what the joint resolution provides:

The existing laws of the United States with reference to public lands shall not apply to such lands in the Hawaiian Islands, but the Congress of the United States shall enact special laws for their management and disposition, providing that all revenues from or proceeds of the same, except as regards such part thereof as may be used or occupied for the civil, military, or naval purposes of the United States or may be established for the use of the local government, shall be used solely for the benefit of the inhabitants of the Hawaiian Islands, for educational or other public purposes.

I think that indicates that Congress of the United States at the time these lands were taken over regarded them as taken over in trust for the benefit of the people of this Territory. I submit that to this committee.

Representative ANGELL. But that would mean, would it not, that they are under the control of the Federal Government, but the revenues from the disposition of them would go to the Territory?

Mr. TAVARES. That is correct, Mr. Angell. But the point I make is that while it is within the power of Congress undoubtedly to reserve those lands, if Hawaii became a State—in other words, to take them entirely away, that is, from the Territory, there is an implied, even an expressed recognition in this joint resolution that gives the benefit of these lands to the people of this Territory and not to the Government of the United States as such. I mean, we are similar to Texas, and that is what I am trying to apply here; we came in full-blown, and this land belonged to us when we came in, and therefore we submit we should be treated somewhat the same way.

Representative ANGELL. I am inclined to agree with you.

Representative DELANEY. It says to the inhabitants of the islands: It does not mean, according to my interpretation, the inhabitants at the time of annexation. It means the inhabitants of the islands who were here at the time the disposition was made of this land.

Mr. TAVARES. That is absolutely true, sir, and the fact will be that if Hawaii becomes a State any citizen of the United States who resides in Hawaii for the required time to be a citizen of the State, which usually is one year, would be entitled to the same benefits, just as he has today.

I would like to say that under this bill, although I am not the sponsor of it, and do not fundamentally wish to state that I am for or against the bill, but speaking only by way of interpretation of the bill, I should like to call the committee's attention to the fact that I read the bill that any citizen of the United States who lives here 5 years from now, would be entitled to the benefit of this bill, only he will have to come here and live 5 years to get the benefits, and to get the same benefits as anyone else who lives here 5 years. It is not as discriminatory as it appears on the face of it.

Representative DELANEY. I didn't go into that detail, or have the time to study it, but I think the intent is in the opening paragraph, which would lead us to believe that a man must be a resident for 5 years prior to the time he was admitted into the armed services. However, we are not going to argue that point.

Mr. CROZIER. I beg your pardon. You are correct there.

Representative DELANEY. Yes, and not only that observation, but the observations I am making will be the observations and arguments made by the Members of Congress when the bill is presented, and if you people cannot convince us by argument, it is going to be a very difficult job for Mr. Farrington to convince the entire body of Congress and have this bill passed.

Chairman LARCADE. Any further questions?

If not, I would like to ask a question. You testified in answer to a question a few minutes ago, propounded by Mr. Delaney, and I took it you are in favor of statehood. Is that right?

Mr. CROZIER. I am in favor of statehood.

Chairman LARCADE. Do you have anything to add, or do you wish to elaborate on this statement for the benefit of the record, or the information of the committee, in regard to the admission of Hawaii to statehood?

Mr. CROZIER. Well, Hawaii, since the war is over, is going to be in line with the traffic to the southern Pacific islands, and those lines are going to cross in Hawaii, and Hawaii needs representation more now in Washington than ever before. We were at the end of the line before, but now we are in the middle of the lines that cross here that go to the southern Pacific and other Pacific islands, and we need more representation—some representation.

Chairman LARCADE. Does anyone present desire to testify or make a statement in regard to this bill that has been read here by Mr. Crozier?

Is there any question by members of the committee?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I ask permission to make a statement.

Chairman LARCADE. Give your name to the clerk of the committee, and your business.

STATEMENT OF LOUIS N. FERNANDEZ

Mr. FERNANDEZ. My name is Louis N. Fernandez, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee. I am a veteran of this war, and the bill, as

I see it, would give something to the disabled veterans. That is, as far as I know; I may be wrong, but as far as I know Hawaii, the Territory, has made no provisions for the veterans coming home, like so many of the States have done. And the least they could do is to think of the fellow coming home that is disabled, and this would be a good chance, at least, to give him a piece of land where he could live. He may not be able to work, and that would be something. It would be a small token of appreciation from the Territory, and the way it is now the Territory cannot dish out these lands because of restrictions covered by the Home Commission Act and the public lands. But if your committee would go up to Congress, and help us out, and give us this land, through this bill, why I am sure that the disabled veterans would be very much appreciative. This is all I have got to say, gentlemen.

Chairman LARCADE. Are there any questions by members of the committee?

Delegate FARRINGTON. You are a disabled veteran, are you?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. No, sir.

Delegate FARRINGTON. You served in the National Guard before you entered the service?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. No, sir.

Delegate FARRINGTON. How long were you in the service?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Thirty months.

Delegate FARRINGTON. Just recently discharged?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Yes, sir; I was discharged a week and one-half ago.

Chairman LARCADE. Any other questions? [No response.]

While you are in the witness chair, sir, would you care to say whether you are in favor of or against statehood for the Territory of Hawaii?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I would rather not answer that at this time, because I have not given it enough thought, but I will say though that before the people of Hawaii decide on whether they want statehood or not I think that they should study the question a little bit more. At the last voting they had on it some years back there was a certain percentage in favor, and there was another lower percentage not in favor. Well, I really believe that the percentage that was in favor for statehood at that time did not fully realize what they were asking for, and also the number of votes cast was comparatively low, too, in respect to the population of the Territory, and also the percentage to the number of eligible citizens in the Territory.

Chairman LARCADE. Well, in view of the vote being more than two to one in favor, and the fact that most people had given consideration to the question before they voted, don't you think that would indicate that the people knew what they were doing at that time?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Well, I would say enough study was not given to the question. I, for one, was approached by a certain individual regarding the question, and a few days later we went to the polls. There are a lot of people in the Territory that did not give it full thought.

Chairman LARCADE. Any questions?

Representative ANGELL. In that respect, don't you think that would be true whenever you vote on it, 10 years from now or 20 or 30 years from now, there would be a lot of people who would not give it the full from now, there would be a lot of people who would not give it the full

Mr. FERNANDEZ. That's true, but wouldn't it be better if they had put some study on it. I mean, through the newspapers?

Representative ANGELL. Well, they have been studying it for about 50 years?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. That's right.

Representative ANGELL. We have voluminous studies and much testimony taken by Congress, when hearings were held, a good many years ago. The committee was favorable to statehood, except the committee felt that due to the unsettled world conditions and the further fact that the people in the Territory had not themselves voted on the question, that those two questions should be determined first before statehood should be considered. Now both those matters have been passed upon, and we had a plebiscite in which 2 to 1 have voted for statehood, and we have had the World War in which perhaps the international relations are as well-settled now as they may ever be. It would seem that the people after a lapse of 20, 30, 40, and even 50 years ought to know their own mind as to whether or not they want statehood. Do you not think that is true?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Correct, sir.

Chairman LARCADE. Are there any other citizens present who desire to testify on the bill under consideration by the committee? [No response.]

Delegate FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I don't know just how this has been handled, but I know that every advance notice of this meeting was given on Maui; I do not know that any formal arrangement was made for the appearance of witnesses, and so far as I know the only person who has qualified and who desires to appear before the committee is Mr. K. K. Kam, and I suggest therefore that the chairman recognize Mr. Kam for the purpose of having him submit his statement.

Chairman LARCADE. Give your full name and business to the reporter.

Mr. K. K. KAM. My name is K. K. Kam, International Executive Board Member of the I. L. W. U., of the C. I. O., representing the laboring group of Hawaii. I am in favor of statehood. I wish to present a statement, Mr. Chairman, for your approval.

Chairman LARCADE. We will be glad to hear from you at this time.

Mr. KAM (reading):

I am presenting my views on the subject of statehood for Hawaii as a representative of the working people of these islands and particularly as a member of the International Executive Board of the International Longshoremen and Warehousemen Union affiliated with the Congress of the Industrial Organization. My views, therefore, are the views of the working people of Hawaii and particularly that section which is organized into unions affiliated with the I. L. W. U., C. I. O.

We believe there are two compelling reasons for the immediate grant of the statehood to Hawaii. One of these reasons, consists of the great and important benefits which would result from statehood from the view point of the common people of these islands; the other reason consists of the equally great and important benefits which the United States of America would derive from Hawaiian statehood.

In connection with the first argument, it must be very clear that the welfare and full destiny of our people cannot be achieved until we are given the opportunity to participate in full measures in the

economic life of the country with which we are allied, and at the same time accept for ourselves a full share of responsibilities as a portion of the people who comprise the United States of America. If statehood is granted to Hawaii, our people will, for the first time, have voice and vote in the Congress of the United States. In that way the people will participate in the democratic processes of the Government by and under which our lives are shaped and regulated; at the same time it would give us an opportunity through our elective representatives to work cooperatively with the other States of the Union toward solving the economic, political, and social problems which are under common and mutual concern to ourselves and to the people on the mainland. On the other hand, without representation we are simply in a position of a subordinate people, although we must comply with the same Federal laws that the States comply and although we are subject to the same measure of taxation and to similar responsibilities. We have no effective voice and no vote in any of these matters. In one way, we are like the people of the original Thirteen Colonies who lived under conditions of injustice which they expressed in the slogan, "No taxation without representation."

We, who are interested in improving the standard of living of the common people, of raising the level of wages, in providing the hours and conditions of work and obtaining action on job improvement, are convinced that without statehood our worthy objective can never be fully achieved. It's a frustration for people of these islands to be placed in the subordinate role which we now occupy. This frustration tends to weaken our efforts to improve social, economic and political conditions of the people. Statehood for Hawaii would be like opening the door and allowing us to enter into the struggle together with all the American people, toward a fuller and happier existence.

The other reason I have mentioned places emphasis upon benefits that will flow to the United States. Our main economic conditions are well known, our basic industries are important and valuable to the mainland. At the same time we have reached the point in the course of history when all intelligent people fully realize how small the world has become. We live in the age of the airplane, the atomic bomb, radar and other scientific advancements which have served to make a small place of the world. The geographical separation of Hawaii from the mainland, is no longer of any significance to the question of statehood. How close Hawaii is to the United States, how important and integral a part of a country, could not be better illustrated than by the fact that it was here at Pearl Harbor that the United States was brought into World War II. Hawaii can no longer be considered as an outpost of American civilization.

Statehood for Hawaii, precisely because it would enable the people of Hawaii to become better citizens by integrating into the political, social, and economic pattern of the American civilization. It would in due time come to full realization how American citizens of the highest caliber form this viewpoint. The United States would be the main beneficiary; already, in fact, the people of these islands have demonstrated the ability to develop in that direction. During this war, the people of Hawaii gave distinguished service for the cause of the United States. Our record, in terms of the purchase of war bonds,

in terms of the donation of blood, in terms of the war effort of our people at home and in terms of the record achieved by those of our people who went into the armed forces and particularly those at the front lines of the war, is a record second to none in the best tradition of the Atlantic Charter and the principles declared by the United Nations Organization. Our people of Hawaii comprising many racial and religious groups, become welded as one in the struggle against fascism. Some of the people on the mainland undoubtedly received the impression shortly after Pearl Harbor, that fifth column activities occurred in the Territory of Hawaii. There had been numerous repudiations of that slanderous and false charge. Only recently the newspaper of this Territory pointed out that there has never been produced one single piece of evidence to demonstrate that the slightest of fifth column activities took place here. The reason that the charge was made in the first place seems to be that individuals here who neglected their duties used this charge as a shield behind which they could conceal their mistakes. However, the plain and simple fact is that, the people of Hawaii of every race and religion and political persuasion, rallied instinctively to the defense of the only country to which they can conscientiously and instinctively have deep love and affection. That country, the United States of America, is the country in which Hawaii desires and needs to become a full fledged State.

Yours for a favorable and kindest consideration on Statehood for Hawaii.

Chairman LARCADE. Do you have any further statement to make?

Mr. KAM. I feel this way, that the common people in Hawaii should want statehood, for this reason: In the past we have had no vote or power in the Congress, and if we have more voting power it will help better to understand the economic, political, and social problems. First, the economic—Hawaii is bound to be discriminated against in its economic benefits and policies as compared to the States. If we had statehood I feel we can fight for a better quota on sugar for Hawaii. Also the refining of raw sugar could be kept in Hawaii, and economic discrimination in any form will be reflected in the standards of living of every man and woman of this Territory. Next, under the Territorial form of government the people here are limited in their democratic form of government: (a) No voting power in Congress, and (b) no power of electing their governor and officials, and next, discrimination on physical grounds and social; getting money for social education, public health, and child care, which will affect every working man and his family, and that is the second reason we ask for statehood. Next, the United States will benefit if Hawaii becomes a State. First, this war has proven that the United States needs Hawaii, and Hawaii's strategical situation and location makes it all the more necessary that Hawaii be made a State with American rights and privileges. Second: The other big nations of the world will be convinced that the United States is sincere in regard to the political equality for its Territories and possessions as provided for in the provisions of the Atlantic Charter.

While I was in Washington, D. C., sometime in October, I made quite a number of contacts, and we had a meeting of the International Executive Board, which was meeting there, where Harry Bridges was our leader there, and then we had meetings, and we did a lot of political work and lots of union work there, and in that way, as

Congress was in session there, I met a lot of Congressmen and spoke to a lot of them, and quite a few have expressed their willingness to "kokua" (help) us in Hawaii here, and help us get statehood. Mr. Angell and Mr. Miller and our Delegate were among those I met over there, and lots more. I also spoke to Field, Magnuson, and a number of them, Wayne Morse, and a lot of others, and they all said they will give us a little help on statehood if we fight for it, and so we did, in fact, and I came back here and I wrote my brief, and I represent 33,000 union members in the Territory here, and so when I go around making my speeches in the Territory I tell them that some of the Congressmen are very much in favor of it, and although I did not have much time to spend in Congress, or to speak to all the Congressmen, and Senators, I said the ones I did talk to feel we should be given every consideration, and that is the reason why I am fighting for statehood right now.

And another reason is based on what I found in the Library of Congress. I went into the Library of Congress and at that time I asked our Delegate here how I could get some figures on the Federal income tax and so forth, and as to what we pay to the Government, to Washington, and he gave me some figures, and if I may I should like to read some of this. It is just a short list.

Chairman LARCADE. For the purpose of the record, I think it would be admissible. You may proceed.

Mr. KAM. May I read it all?

Chairman LARCADE. Do you appear for your organization, as an official of your organization, or in your individual capacity?

Mr. KAM. Yes, for the organization.

Chairman LARCADE. How many members?

Mr. KAM. Thirty-three thousand, sir.

Chairman LARCADE. You would say that they are substantially all in favor of statehood?

Mr. KAM. Yes, they are.

Delegate FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, as the document from which he proposes to read is not prolonged, and as it is pertinent to the question, I would like to ask unanimous consent that it be incorporated in full in the record.

Representative DELANEY. Reserving the right to object; I don't know whether this is correct or not, and where this man got the information.

Delegate FARRINGTON. I can state to Mr. Delaney that it was prepared by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress in Washington.

Representative DELANEY. I will withdraw the objection, and consent to it being received, subject to correction.

Chairman DELANEY. Without objection the document will be accepted as part of the record.

Mr. KAM. (reading):

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
REFERENCE DEPARTMENT, LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE,
Washington, D. C., September 7, 1945.

HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FARRINGTON: This is in response to your request for a statement of the relative position of Hawaii to the various States with respect to Internal Revenue collections during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945. We enclose two

tables; one shows total collections and the other shows per capita collections in Hawaii, the several States, the District of Columbia, and Alaska. (See also exhibits Nos. 4a-e.)

Total collections of internal revenue in Hawaii increased more rapidly between 1944 and 1945 than collections in all States and territories combined, the percentage of increase between 1944 and 1945 being 15.4 (Hawaii) and 9.2 (total), and the total internal revenue collected in Hawaii exceeded that of 14 States during the fiscal year of 1945. The States are: Arizona, Arkansas, Idaho, Maine, Mississippi, Montana, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Dakota, South Dakota, Utah, Vermont, and Wyoming. These States had also provided less revenue than provided by Hawaii in fiscal 1944.

As shown in one of the tables attached, per capita collections of internal revenue in Hawaii were greater than per capita collections in 39 States (81.25% of all States) during 1945. Hawaii's rank was higher during 1945 than during 1944; in the earlier year per capita collections had been larger in Hawaii than in 36 States.

The States in which per capita collections were smaller than in Hawaii are: Alabama, Arizona,* Arkansas,* Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Idaho,* Indiana, Iowa, Maine, Kentucky, Louisiana, Kansas, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Mississippi,* Missouri, Montana,* Nebraska, Nevada,* New Hampshire,* New Jersey, New Mexico,* North Carolina, North Dakota,* Oklahoma, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota,* Tennessee, Texas, Utah,* Vermont,* Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and Wyoming.*

Of the States in the list for 1945, Massachusetts, New Jersey, and Rhode Island are new. Collections of internal revenue in these States were larger in 1944, but smaller in 1945, than in Hawaii.

(An asterisk indicates that both total and per capita collections were smaller in the States than in Hawaii.)

Very truly yours,

ERNEST S. GRIFFITH,

Director, Legislative Reference Service.

The next document is (reading):

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS, WASHINGTON REFERENCE DEPARTMENT, LEGISLATIVE
REFERENCE SERVICE

SEPTEMBER 7, 1945.

Total collections of internal revenue by the United States in each State, the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska, and the District of Columbia, fiscal year of 1945

States and Territories:

Alabama-----	\$253, 910, 580
Arizona-----	71, 202, 175
Arkansas-----	98, 538, 918
California-----	3, 722, 459, 220
Colorado-----	226, 947, 256
Connecticut-----	875, 705, 209
Delaware-----	466, 299, 089
Florida-----	784, 767, 774
Georgia-----	710, 996, 774
Idaho-----	59, 805, 444
Illinois-----	3, 766, 335, 176
Indiana-----	943, 139, 224
Iowa-----	321, 171, 180
Kansas-----	423, 925, 766
Kentucky-----	698, 954, 574
Louisiana-----	350, 546, 549
Maine-----	150, 087, 933
Maryland-----	848, 696, 129
Massachusetts-----	1, 490, 938, 452
Michigan-----	2, 579, 823, 895
Minnesota-----	651, 966, 415
Mississippi-----	91, 060, 203
Missouri-----	1, 146, 082, 266
Montana-----	61, 653, 137
Nebraska-----	245, 214, 598
Nevada-----	33, 862, 404

States and Territories—Continued.

New Hampshire-----	\$31, 153, 496
New Jersey-----	1, 439, 127, 166
New Mexico-----	37, 685, 763
New York-----	8, 261, 525, 191
North Carolina-----	874, 983, 615
North Dakota-----	41, 473, 970
Ohio-----	3, 055, 951, 071
Oklahoma-----	307, 278, 299
Oregon-----	318, 918, 695
Pennsylvania-----	3, 712, 018, 582
Rhode Island-----	246, 342, 330
South Carolina-----	181, 578, 006
South Dakota-----	37, 981, 520
Tennessee-----	335, 249, 937
Texas-----	1, 152, 529, 149
Utah-----	84, 635, 031
Vermont-----	52, 495, 261
Virginia-----	823, 090, 896
Washington-----	625, 823, 377
West Virginia-----	191, 324, 618
Wisconsin-----	916, 168, 247
Wyoming-----	29, 410, 348
Alaska-----	19, 802, 709
District of Columbia-----	415, 128, 315
Hawaii-----	173, 999, 227

Then I have another document, reading:

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS, WASHINGTON REFERENCE DEPARTMENT, LEGISLATIVE
REFERENCE SERVICE

*Per capita collections of Internal Revenue by the United States, in each State,
the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska, and the District of Columbia*

States and Territories:

Alabama	\$90
Arizona	112
Arkansas	56
California	426
Colorado	198
Connecticut	493
Delaware	1,643
Florida	163
Georgia	130
Idaho	113
Illinois	487
Indiana	276
Iowa	143
Kansas	239
Kentucky	266
Louisiana	138
Maine	189
Maryland	399
Massachusetts	358
Michigan	475
Minnesota	260
Mississippi	42
Missouri	319
Montana	133
Nebraska	202
Nevada	217

States and Territories—Continued

New Hampshire	\$178
New Jersey	345
New Mexico	71
New York	654
North Carolina	248
North Dakota	79
Ohio	447
Oklahoma	149
Oregon	263
Pennsylvania	402
Rhode Island	316
South Carolina	94
South Dakota	68
Tennessee	117
Texas	168
Utah	140
Vermont	169
Virginia	257
Washington	305
West Virginia	112
Wisconsin	308
Wyoming	114
Alaska	323
District of Columbia	448
Hawaii	360

SOURCE.—U. S. Bureau of Internal Revenue collections. Released August 20, 1945.
John C. Jackson, General Research Section.

Representative MILLER. I would like to say that I know Mr. Kam, and I know of the fine work he is doing.

Chairman LARCADE. Is there any further statement?

Delegate FARRINGTON. No other witnesses have formally requested the privilege of appearing, and I would like to ask at this point that the committee ask the ranking public official of the Territory present to state his position on this issue. Senator Harold Rice of Maui. [Applause.]

Chairman LARCADE. I would be very glad to have the Senator appear before the committee and make such statements as he desires.

Mr. HAROLD W. RICE. My name is Harold Waterhouse Rice, senator from the second senatorial district.

I voted against statehood at the last plebiscite, but I am convinced that we should have statehood at this time. Conditions have changed, and, as you all know, the world has changed a lot, and I think that we can do better work as a State. I kind of resent being in the Interior Department. I think we ought to have two United States Senators and a full-fledged Congressman from Hawaii.

I think that we ought to have the privilege of electing our own Governor, and maybe in a constitutional convention they could decide then on whether the Governor should appoint, as he does in some of the States, our judiciary, or whether they should be elected.

Representative ANGELL. You also have the additional right of passing your own laws without referring them to Congress.

Mr. RICE. That's right. I have been very much interested at the hearing in listening to what has been said about the amendment to the land laws, as I was one of the commission that went to Washington to put through the rehabilitation bill. I think that the suggestion that has been made here by Congressman Delaney that we should maybe amend Senator Crozier's bill so as to give the veterans a preference, might be in order. We have done that locally in civil service. We have given our returning veterans a preference in classifications.

Chairman LARCADE. Are there any questions by any members of the committee?

Delegate FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the witness if in his opinion the people of Maui favor statehood in the same or greater proportions than was expressed by the plebiscite of 1940.

Mr. RICE. Oh, I think that the people on Maui would vote quite a bit heavier in favor of statehood than they did at the last chance. As Mr. K. K. Kam has said, he has brought out the arbitrary ruling on the amount of sugar that Hawaii is allowed, and that it will affect the whole financial structure of the Territory.

I am very much in favor of Secretary Anderson's program in agriculture, and I think that he is doing a fine job, and I hope that we will work a plan out by which we will get away from the use of the incentive plan on sugar, and which will give us a price of sugar that is equitable. I think you, Mr. Chairman, will probably agree with me on that, you being from a sugar State.

Chairman LARCADE. You are quite correct, sir.

Mr. RICE. I have had some correspondence with our delegate on that subject, and I am very much pleased with the progress that is being made in that Department. As a cattleman, too, I think that he has done a good job, and is doing a good job with the beef industry.

Chairman LARCADE. I agree with you quite fully. All of us here present have served with the new Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Anderson, and we all have a very high opinion of him, and we respect him, and we think he is very capable, and if left alone he will help us solve our agricultural problems.

At this time, I want to ask you this: When you made an observation a few moments ago in respect to the vote that was cast at this district at the plebiscite held in 1940 with regard to the question of whether or not the people favored statehood, and you said you voted against it, I would like you to state whether or not it is not your opinion that the people that voted did understand the question, or did not?

Mr. RICE. Well, I think most of them understood the question. At the last plebiscite, at that time conditions were entirely different. I feel that the conditions have changed so much that I think that we should have a greater voice and we see so much that is going on around us that should be changed immediately, if it is possible, that we are facing a different situation than was the case in 1940. We are an outlying island, and since the war started we have never had our shipping returned to us, and we depend on ships, to get our produce there, and the War Shipping Board is doing a fine job, but some of the men here who are taking the produce to Honolulu, they realize that they were working under very difficult conditions, by boat. The air-

plane service has tried to do its part to care for this county, and has done a very good job, but we need modern ships to care for the crops that we send down.

We could send down a lot of lettuce from here, but if you put it in a hot hold overnight, it arrives in Honolulu in pretty poor shape. When the Navy accepted our lettuce on Maui they put it in a hold that was chilled, and it arrived in Honolulu in beautiful shape. The whole shipping industry, meaning by that the interisland shipping industry, needs to be changed. I think the industry is willing to tackle it. Mr. Kennedy realizes, and he is the president of the interisland, he realizes the situation, and he has a man down here studying it, but we are tied up with the shipping, and we should get relief as soon as possible. [See statement No. 21.]

Chairman LARCADE. Well, with respect to the question I propounded a few moments ago, is it your opinion that if this question were submitted again at this time that the majority would be substantially greater in favor of statehood than it was at the time of the plebiscite?

Mr. RICE. There would be a very much bigger majority. As you know, no matter how good a bill is, there will always be objectors.

Chairman LARCADE. That's right.

Mr. RICE. And there will still be objectors to it, but I think these fellows who have gone into the question thoroughly will be for it, and I certainly appreciate what our Delegate has done on the question of statehood and I think that this community appreciates the committee's coming to the Territory, and in your coming to Maui, particularly, and giving us a chance to be heard.

Representative DELANEY. Mr. Rice, do you favor opening up additional small farms?

Mr. RICE. Yes, I would.

Representative DELANEY. I was very much disturbed by an article I read in the newspapers yesterday wherein it stated that in all of the Territory only 40 tons of Irish potatoes were raised. I think we ought to do something about that. [Laughter.]

Mr. RICE. Well, we have had unusually good yields of potatoes in 1945 on this island. One particular farmer had a run of 25 bags of potatoes for every bag of seed he had planted, and that is a big yield.

Representative MILLER. Mr. Delaney is being sold more and more on this Territory, down here, and I am sure if he had an assured supply of Irish potatoes maybe you could understand his desire to come down here.

Mr. RICE. I just want to say one thing in regard to the opening of our land. The unfortunate part, I think, is that most of the homesteaders were given too much land, and they were given 40 acres, which is too much. No man can cultivate 40 acres, or take care of 40 acres on Maui, particularly, with a limited water supply. The success of our small farmers is due to the fact, I believe, that they have limited themselves, in area, to what they can economically handle with their own manpower, by which I mean a man and his wife and children, so forth, and that is why we have so many successful small farmers here, and they have been as successful as others have been anywhere in the States that I know of.

Delegate FARRINGTON. I would like Mr. Rice to state briefly, for the record, his background of public service. You were born here?

Mr. RICE. I was born at Waikiki, pretty near to where you are staying at the Halekulani Hotel, in 1883, and I was educated—we had a private school on Kauai and then I went to a public school on Oahu and then to Lawrenceville, N. J., and to Princeton, and after that I worked a little on Kauai and then I came to Maui in 1906 and worked for the sugar industry until 1916, when I went in for myself as a rancher in 1918. I ran for the senate and was elected to the senate and I had no opposition for 16 years in the senate and then I ran for chairman of the board and then I served as chairman of the board for 3 years, and then I resigned as chairman of the board, due to my wife's illness and then I ran again for the senate in 1940, and I was elected that year, and I have been serving since then, most of the time as a Republican, but now as a Democrat. [Laughter.]

Chairman LARCADE. Are there any other questions?

Representative ANGELL. Senator, you spoiled a good record there. Senator Rice, you have had extensive experience, as you have just recited here, and on the mainland as well as on the islands, and I presume, of course, you have had quite a considerable experience on the mainland. You know the people here and you also know many of the people of the continental United States. In your broad observation of conditions here, and the people, their industries, and their social and economic life, and also those on the continental United States, is it your opinion that the people here are as fully able and competent to handle their own affairs as a state, as are the people on the mainland?

Mr. RICE. Yes, I am familiar with that, and I am very sure they are as well qualified here to handle their affairs as the people in any citizen group in any State of the Union.

Representative ANGELL. Can you give any reason why a community of the size of this Territory should not be entitled to the same form of government under the framework of the Constitution in the continental United States?

Mr. RICE. No; I could not give any reason.

Representative ANGELL. Isn't it your opinion that to deny statehood to the Territory runs counter to the principles that we have been defending in the war that has just closed; namely, that the small nations of the world should have a government of their own choosing?

Mr. RICE. Yes, that's right.

Representative ANGELL. Wouldn't you say that there is a fundamental breaking away from that principle to deny the people of the Hawaiian Territory that right, in view of the extended length of time this community has been preparing for full self-government?

Mr. RICE. I think we should get it as soon as possible.

Representative ANGELL. Thank you. That is all, Senator.

Representative DELANEY. Mr. Rice, I was deeply impressed by the modern hospital that I was shown through this afternoon prior to coming to this meeting. May I ask you to add to the record, briefly, some history of that hospital, and how it came about, and what you are doing to maintain it?

Mr. RICE. Well, Dr. Dearney, who was our doctor at the Kula Sanatorium, was requested by the Kula Sanatorium Board to go over with Mr. Dickey, one of the leading architects of the Territory, plans for a new hospital. These plans were drawn up, and we found our own

funds to be quite inadequate, but fortunately you had PWA funds that came along and that gave us twice as much money as we had, and the hospital is the result.

I might say that a classmate of mine, Mr. Colenhaver, is building the new Tripler Hospital, and I had Mr. Anderson and Mr. Colenhaver, and by the way, both of them came from the State of New York—they came up to look at our hospital, and I think that this Kula Hospital was built about 10 years ago, and the maintenance has been very good, and the class of equipment, and so forth, that was installed, according to these gentlemen, is still quite modern.

Does that cover it fully enough?

Representative DELANEY. Yes. And you people, of course, are indebted to PWA, in part, for having that hospital?

Mr. RICE. The PWA; that's right. I am sorry we did not have time to take you up to the top of the mountain because running from here up to the top of the mountain we have a Federal-aid road all the way up.

Chairman LARCADE. Are there any further questions?

Delegate FARRINGTON. I believe in introducing Mr. Rice we made an error in protocol, as we have also present the speaker of the house of representatives, Mr. Paschoal, and I will ask him to state briefly his point of view on this issue of statehood. Mr. Paschoal is the ranking legislator present, of the Territorial legislature, I believe. Mr. Paschoal.

Mr. PASCHOAL. My name is Manuel Gomes Paschoal. I was speaker in the last session of the legislature and I have served in the legislature for the past 30 years. I might state that at the last session of the legislature Mr. Marcallino, another legislator, and myself introduced a resolution on statehood, and, as you know, the house of representatives of this Territory is composed of 30 members—6 from Maui, 8 from the island of Hawaii, 4 from Kauai, and 12 from Oahu—and when the vote was taken it was 100 percent for that resolution asking to have statehood for this Territory.

Chairman LARCADE. Is there anything else?

Delegate FARRINGTON. That is, requesting statehood now?

Mr. PASCHOAL. Yes.

Chairman LARCADE. Is there any further question?

Delegate FARRINGTON. In your opinion, has the sentiment for statehood on Maui changed in the five years since the plebiscite showed the percentage to be more than 2 to 1 for statehood?

Mr. PASCHOAL. I think that if a vote were taken today you would find 5 or 6, or maybe 10 to 1 for statehood. That is my own opinion.

Chairman LARCADE. Will you tell us how long you have lived here?

Mr. PASCHOAL. I have lived here on Maui for 44 years, and I have lived the rest of my time on Oahu.

Chairman LARCADE. Don't you think that the people when they voted on this question of statehood understood the question?

Mr. PASCHOAL. I think they did. I know I was here and I voted for it, and at that time I remember there were different men from the different parties who came to Maui, both Republican and Democrats, and they got a very big gathering, and the people all seemed to understand the question at that time. That is from my personal observation.

Chairman LARCADE. That it was fully explained to them?

Mr. PASCHOAL. Yes.

Chairman LARCADE. Are there any further questions by members of the committee?

Rep. ANGELL. During your many years of experience in the Territory, and in the legislature, and based on that, do you feel that the people of the Territory have as much interest in public questions, political questions, social welfare, and community interest, as the people generally do in the continental United States?

Mr. PASCHOAL. I think so, and even more, and they do more today than they did 25 years ago. That is my experience.

Rep. ANGELL. That is all.

Delegate FARRINGTON. Will you state, briefly, for the records, your background of public service?

Mr. PASCHOAL. When I first came into life, and then when I started to work, as a young man, here, I became coachman for the American Minister in 1893. I was quite young then. Then I went to work, and attending school, and going to work as coachman for the American Minister, and at that time he was the American Minister who was representing the American Government here, and I was still a coachman for him when the flag was raised in Honolulu, August 12, if I can remember correctly. After that I went to the Customs, and I worked in the Customs for 1 year, and then I came to Maui, and I have been on Maui ever since. This has been my home, and I expect it will be my home until I die. I have raised three children, eight grandchildren, and one great-grandchild, and I have 63 years of age.

Chairman LARCADE. What occupation have you followed, sir?

Mr. PASCHOAL. When I came to Maui I went to work on a plantation as a luna, and Mr. Rice came there also on the same plantation, the Hawaiian Commercial Co., and from a luna I became a field boss and from that position I became foreman, and then I became a policeman, and from a policeman I became a welfare worker on Hawaiian Commercial Plantation and stayed there until I returned in 1937 on account of my health at that time and I have a business here, a movie business, and I am still running that.

Representative TAYLOR. You are a Republican, aren't you, Mr. Paschoal?

Mr. PASCHOAL. Yes, sir. I might say I am a good Republican, and I also received many Democratic votes.

Representative TAYLOR. I would say you are a good politician.

Mr. PASCHOAL. That may be too.

Chairman LARCADE. Thank you very much.

Delegate FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I think that covers the case for the affirmative, unless someone else wants to speak on that subject on that side. I would like to suggest that the chairman invite anyone who is opposed to statehood to make a brief statement, if they care to do so.

Chairman LARCADE. Yes.

Mr. WOLLAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I am on the affirmative side of the statehood question, but I would like to give you a brief statement, if possible.

Chairman LARCADE. Very well, we will be glad to hear you. State your name to the reporter.

MR. ARTHUR D. WOLLAWAY. My name is Arthur D. Wollaway, and I am employed on a plantation, the Maui Agricultural Co., and I would like to state that I was born and raised in the Territory, born way back in 1912, and I am still a young man. I was educated in the public and private schools here and elsewhere, and ended up at the University of California.

As I see it, in this argument against statehood, there are three points that have been brought up: No. 1, land monopoly, or scarcity, maybe; No. 2, big business control; No. 3, your racial problem.

Now, these points of observation are all valid, and I am not arguing that point in making my observations for what it is worth, but are not the same problems points of argument in cities and States of the Nation, and in existence there?

Now in my No. 1, scarcity of land: I sent my wife from Hawaii, and she went away with the children when the war started, and they ended up in San Francisco, after they had gone to Colorado, and she together with other residents of the Territory ran across this same problem over there. This was all brought on, mainly, by the war. We had some inflation on real estate prior to the war but we did not have much of a problem due to a scarcity of land, other than people desiring to go upon homesteads. I am talking about residential land.

No. 2, big business: Whereas the Big Five is big in this community, as compared to corporations on the mainland they are small potatoes. I don't see any difference between these corporations in Hawaii and corporations such as the Standard Oil Co. in the States, except that those corporations on the mainland are much larger.

No. 3, racial problems: This is a problem which is met with in any State; and it always has been a problem. One of the points here, is that as far as Japan is concerned, and that is one of the main points, the records have proven that these men of Japanese ancestry have been good citizens. As far as problems with different races are concerned, I am sure you will find these same problems on the mainland, whether in Louisiana, Alabama, or New York.

Those are my only points of argument, these three main points that are used as an argument against statehood, or in opposition to statehood. I do not see where those three problems there, or points of argument, cast any reflection on statehood, as compared with what the Territory has done for the Nation, and, in the matter of taxation and in education, and what we have done by ourselves in the matter of being self-sufficient, and in taking care of our public school problem, and our public health program, and everything else that goes with it, and may I say that there has never been a bread line in this Territory such as are found in so many places, and that in spite of the criticism of the so-called monopolistic set-up here, and I went to school in the State of Washington, in 1932, and there was not a soup line set up that was not filled to capacity, and there were many men looking for any kind of a job. I have never known of people here who have had to look into rubbish tins for food. In fact, this has not happened here and there have always been jobs for those who wanted to work and that is something that cannot be said for all of the States.

I will agree with you that the house needs cleaning—but what house does not need cleaning?—and if you are going to argue on those points

you are getting nowhere, and you will just be arguing back and forth to no purpose.

In view of what the Territory has done in respect to all these problems, and that we are being self-sufficient and providing for ourselves, I believe those are the main factors to stress in our argument for statehood.

Chairman LARCADE. Are there any questions?

Representative ANGELL. Granting that these arguments about maladministration that are advanced against statehood are sound, are there any reasons why those problems could not be settled just as well under statehood as they could be under the Territorial government?

Mr. WOLLAWAY. Absolutely, there are no reasons why that should not be so. Every community is striving to benefit itself and a minority is always a condition that is worth while—a good strong minority is a good thing, and it takes a good strong minority to bring these things out and we have always been striving to better ourselves, as all communities are trying to do, and I do not see how that can be used as an argument against statehood. I cannot see it in any sense of the word.

Chairman LARCADE. Does any other member of the committee desire to question the witness?

Delegate FARRINGTON. Then, as one who has been born and raised in Hawaii, you favor statehood?

Mr. WOLLAWAY. In principle, yes. We should have statehood; otherwise our Constitution is all wet.

Chairman LARCADE. Are there any other questions? (No response.) Thank you very much.

We want to give a full opportunity to every citizen who desires to appear, either appearing for or against statehood, and as Mr. Farrington stated to you a few moments ago, a full notice of our visit here has been given in the public press and I think due notice has been given of the intention of this committee to hold this meeting and hearing here today, and before we close the meeting I want to say again that if there is anyone here present who desires to appear before this committee, either to testify in favor or against the question of statehood, we would be glad to hear them. (No response.)

Otherwise, as there seems to be no one else who desires to appear either for the affirmative or the negative, we will proceed to close the meeting. Evidently no one desires to appear, so we will conclude the meeting at this time, and before leaving I desire to thank the people of Maui who have provided us with this very fine reception, and to thank you for the very gracious reception you have accorded to the committee and for the courtesies that they have extended to us in holding this meeting. The meeting will now stand adjourned.

(The meeting was adjourned at 5:12 p. m., Friday, January 11, 1946.)

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII

SATURDAY, JANUARY 12, 1946

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE TERRITORIES,
Kalamaula, Molokai, T. H., along the roadside.

The committee met at 11 a. m., Hon. Henry D. Larcade (chairman) presiding.

Present: Representative Henry D. Larcade, Louisiana, chairman; Representative James J. Delaney, New York, member; Representative George P. Miller, California, member; Representative Dean P. Taylor, New York, member; Representative Homer D. Angell, Oregon, member; Delegate Joseph R. Farrington, Hawaii, member; Irwin W. Silverman, Esq., chief counsel for House Territories Subcommittee; C. Nils Tavares, Esq., attorney general, Hawaii; Dudley C. Lewis, Esq., deputy attorney general, Hawaii.

Chairman LARCADE. The meeting will come to order. I wanted to stop here and ask Mr. Farrington to explain to us something about the taro project which we have just seen, and so Mr. Farrington could give us a description on the spot there, as to what we saw.

Delegate FARRINGTON. I would like first to introduce to you the executive secretary of the Hawaiian Homes Commission, Mr. Julian Yates, who can explain to you more fully than I can just what the purpose of that visit was to the taro project, and what we saw while we were there.

Mr. JULIAN YATES. Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, my name is Julian Yates, and I am the executive secretary of the Hawaiian Homes Commission.

Taro, as you know, is the main food of the Hawaiians, and it requires certain types of land for it to do well. It requires a tremendous amount of water. It is impossible to plant taro up on the highlands there without water. The lands are too dry in those places. Now, these people, here, the homesteaders, approached the Commission, recently, about 2 or 3 months ago, and asked the Commission if the Commission would be willing to let them have this piece of land which you just visited and where you saw the people working, so that they might try out their luck at taro planting.

This group that you saw working over there is a Mormon group, and they were self-organized and that is the group that is working there today, and whom you talked to. Now, they have asked the Commission for the use of that land and have also asked the Commission for certain assistance, and for the use of certain equipment, like bulldozers and whatnot. Later on, when they have cleared some of this land we may have to give them some assistance and when

we do so they will pay the cost of the fuel, and the cost of the operator, and there will probably be no other charge. I am almost certain the Commission will make no charge for the equipment itself.

Representative ANGELL. The lands themselves are swampish?

Mr. YATES. Yes, the land is very swampy, and they have other plans about getting an area cut through going way down to the beach so that they would drain off some of that water. It is difficult to work in there with mechanical equipment, and I doubt whether a bulldozer can go through there and hold out with the work, but they may get a drag. However, we have two of our Commissioners who are engineers, and they are going down to take a look at that and see what can be done.

Chairman LARCADE. What is the name of that place that we visited?

Mr. YATES. It is known as Palaa Beach.

Chairman LARCADE. About how many people are working in there?

Mr. YATES. About 50 or 60 people are now working in there.

Chairman LARCADE. And they are working voluntarily?

Mr. YATES. All of this work is voluntary.

Chairman LARCADE. And they are working about 2 days a week?

Mr. YATES. They started off with the idea of working every Saturday and I understand, I have been informed, that they are going to make that 2 days a week to bring the work along faster.

Chairman LARCADE. How long have they been engaged in doing that type of work?

Mr. YATES. Today is the third turn-out they have had. Today is the third.

Chairman LARCADE. They hope to convert that into taro lands?

Mr. YATES. Yes.

Representative ANGELL. I notice most of them seem to be families, and are they families who have a homestead in this area?

Mr. YATES. Yes. I have written over to the island of Hawaii for a certain type of seed and will get it through the experiment station, which we hope will do well in this type of land.

Delegate FARRINGTON. How many families are involved in this project?

Mr. YATES. I think there are 30 or 40 families.

Delegate FARRINGTON. And about how many people?

Mr. YATES. I would judge there are about 25 or 30 children there this morning. The families, I would judge, would comprise about 150 people.

Delegate FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, does that cover it?

Representative ANGELL. I understand one of the gentlemen in charge of that project is a member of the Territorial legislature?

Mr. YATES. Yes.

Delegate FARRINGTON. His name is Alfred Apaka Afat.

Representative TAYLOR. That shows the character of the people.

Representative ANGELL. Yes, I wanted to ask about that because it shows the character and type of people who are taking it up over there, and who are developing this project.

Mr. YATES. The Hawaiian Homes Commission Act of 1920 was approved on July 9, 1921, by the Congress of the United States, and while we are on the spot now, where it was first tried—where we first tried to put the people on the homesteads, the first 22 homesteaders

who were put on the agricultural land, they were put in on these lands here which you see over there on the upper side of the road.

Representative MILLER. What do you call this area over here?

Mr. YATES. The homestead area is known as the Kalanianaʻole homesteads and the country is known as Kalamaula. Then on the lower side of the road over here, they cut the lower side of the road off into house lots or residential lots. At the outset these people over here who were farming here were very successful, according to the records. They had water with which to irrigate their little holdings, but later on they struck salt and there was too much salt in the water, and as a result it killed off the plants, rather than bringing forth any planting, and that put them in a very bad way, and they lost quite a bit of money.

Representative ANGELL. Did the water come from wells?

Mr. YATES. Yes, and this is a well you can see right back here [indicating].

Now, in 1924, they opened up a portion of what is known as the Hoolehua homestead, a year later, and then they added more areas, and we brought it up to approximately 150 homesteads of a 40-acre tract. When we get up there, we will take a look at those places and will go into it with more detail. We are going up there later today.

Delegate FARRINGTON. You might state for the record who the first members of the Hawaiian Homes Commission were.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Cooke here might be able to tell us who they were.

Delegate FARRINGTON. Mr. Cooke was a member of the first Hawaiian Homes Commission.

Mr. GEORGE COOKE. Yes, and I was the first executive officer.

Delegate FARRINGTON. And Prince Kuhio was also a member?

Mr. COOKE. Yes.

Delegate FARRINGTON. He was a Delegate to Congress from Hawaii for 20 years?

Mr. COOKE. Yes.

Delegate FARRINGTON. His name was Kalanianaʻole?

Mr. YATES. Yes.

Delegate FARRINGTON. And that is the name that was given to the project?

Mr. COOKE. Yes, but before we started up they called in experts from all over the Territory; experts in sugar, taro, cattle, and pineapple, who went over the whole project, and decided where to start the homesteads, and they had to start with some irrigation, and they found an old spring down there, which is the reason this district was selected and the Hawaiians had used it, and we dug a well and came within about 4 feet of where the spring was, and they put in a temporary wooden flume that ran through that section and they did very well with it. Then when the flume leaked they quit pumping. They say it went too salty, but I doubt it. I think the reason was they didn't want to repair the flume.

Then other interests developed pineapple farther on, and this was more or less neglected. There is some kind of politics in it.

Delegate FARRINGTON. For the information of the members of the committee, it might be interesting to them to know that Mr. Cooke has lived here on Molokai since 1908.

Mr. COOKE. With my wife, don't forget.

Delegate FARRINGTON. And he served for many years as a member of the Territorial legislature, as a senator, and he was president of the senate.

Mr. COOKE. I was in the senate when this bill passed, and with my brother I helped to put the bill through, and a Congressman from California wanted to know what the hell the ulterior motive was in voting for a bill like this.

Delegate FARRINGTON. Does that give you enough background on this subject?

Chairman LARCADE. Yes.

Representative MILLER. On the way down here, Senator Cooke, you gave us a very interesting account about the water situation here and other developments. Will you tell us what has been done in the line of investigation by the Reclamation Bureau to bring water in here and where it stopped about the time the war came on?

Mr. COOKE. Yes. The American Sugar Co. started operations here before annexation, and they dug wells, and had in those days steam pumps, and it was not worth while to put in anything less than a 5,000,000-gallon pump, and where they put in these pumps the wells were just shallow wells, and by using the 5,000,000-gallon pump it resulted in bringing up the salt water, so the American Sugar Co. failed as a sugar proposition. That was long before my time, about 1898, and at that time they brought out a man from the Geological Survey, and he made a survey of the possibility of bringing water over from the windward side of the island. That has been in our minds ever since. That is the only way of getting sufficient irrigation water for this side of the island.

In 1909, when Governor Frear was here, there were efforts made to open up homestead lands. Formerly, in those days, they took sugarcane lands, and high productive lands, that were bringing in a big revenue, and Mr. Frear, and Mr. Newell, the head of the irrigation service, went over this question, and they were over here and looked over the situation and we had a little mass meeting and the matter was discussed and we had a meeting with the head of the Reclamation Service who was invited here by the Homes Commission to advise the Homes Commission. At that time he was putting in projects in California, and doing well with them, and Mr. Thurston, of the Advertiser, had read about it and through his insistence, as well as that of Dr. Elwood Mead, of the University of California, who at that time came out here, and who, in fact, came here twice, and he later came with Secretary Work of the Interior Department, to look over the Homes Commission project, and then later Dr. Mead became the head of the Reclamation Service and through him he gave his influence and help to this project, and the survey was put through, at a cost of \$50,000. There was a survey by the chamber of commerce and an endorsement by the Engineers' Association of the territory, and the University of Hawaii Extension Service, so it has had a good background. Sam King introduced a bill and it passed through the House of Representatives to forward this project, but it was killed in the Senate.

Representative DELANEY. I would like to ask a few questions. Why was it that this site was selected?

Mr. COOKE. Because it could get irrigation water. It was brackish, but it was irrigation water.

Representative DELANEY. There are many other sites that have better possibilities than this. Is that not so?

Mr. COOKE. Where?

Representative DELANEY. Federal loan land. Do you mean to say that there is no other site that is better; that has better possibilities, that is owned by the Federal Government, than this particular one?

Mr. COOKE. There are better ones, that are high producing lands and that were bringing in revenues to the Territory. The Territory is interested, I mean.

Representative DELANEY. This was started to help these people, not to put them on a piece of arid land, such as occurs here. Why was not a better site selected?

Mr. COOKE. This was extremely good land, if the water had lasted. but it didn't work out.

Representative DELANEY. It does not look to me as if any investigation was made before this site was selected.

Mr. COOKE. There was.

Representative DELANEY. I am not satisfied that it was, from what I can see here. You have taken and put people on this land and they have no way of irrigating. That is my reaction. So far as this irrigation goes, it seems to me that there should be some way these people can earn a living without the expenditure of millions of dollars of Federal funds. It seems to me that there should be some land that is owned by the Federal Government that could have been opened up as a homestead. Is it because they don't want the people to succeed, and that they want them to go broke in order to get a supply of labor?

Mr. COOKE. That is not fair of you, to say that.

Representative DELANEY. I am asking my question.

Mr. COOKE. No, it is not a fact.

Representative DELANEY. I would like to know to my satisfaction why an investigation was not made before this land was occupied for homesteads.

Mr. COOKE. An investigation was made, sir. We had experts from the university, and sugar and pineapple and cattle experts and dairy people who came up here and they investigated the land and its possibilities.

Representative DELANEY. As far as the pineapple people go, I would not be interested in their investigation, because what they are interested in is labor, and if these people were once transplanted here and could not make a go of it on this land, they would have to go back to the pineapple or sugar fields to work.

Mr. COOKE. We had to get something besides sugar and pineapples because those are not homesteading crops, in my opinion. They take too much capital per acre, and they are crops that take 2 years before you get any returns, and what they want to get is something that can be sold locally, and that was the object of putting it here in this location and doing it the way it was done.

Representative DELANEY. I agree with you that it failed in its purpose. It failed because there was no adequate water supply.

Mr. COOKE. It was artificial, and we had to pump it, yes. That is, we had to pump the water, but the water was there. We had to pump it just as they do in other places and as is done in many other projects where water has to be pumped. There is no flowing water here on this property.

Chairman LARCADE. Are there any other questions by members of the committee? [No response.]

Do you have any further statement to make, Mr. Yates?

Mr. YATES. No, unless you wish to ask me any further questions.

Chairman LARCADE. Then we will proceed on our inspection trip. (The committee left the site of the taking of this testimony at 11 a. m., January 12, 1946.)

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII

SATURDAY JANUARY 12, 1946

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEES ON THE TERRITORIES,
Hoolehua Community Hall, Molokai, T. H.

The committee met at 12:20 p. m., Hon. Henry D. Larcade (chairman) presiding.

(Continuation of Molokai meeting held at 11 a. m., all parties being present as before.)

Chairman LARCADE. Ladies and gentlemen, the meeting will come to order. This is a subcommittee of the Committee on Territories of the House of Representatives of the United States, sent here under a resolution of Congress passed on April 30, 1945, for the purpose of making an investigation of and holding hearings with respect to legislation pending in matters affecting the Territory of Hawaii.

Due notice has been given in advance of our intended visit, through the press and otherwise, and a notice of this meeting has been given in advance by newspapers and otherwise, and at this time I desire to call upon a gentleman who it is not necessary for me to introduce to you, because you know him well, very well, but I will ask him to present to the committee, for the record, a statement of the main purpose of the hearing, at this particular point. It now gives me great pleasure to present to you your own Delegate, and our friend, the Delegate from Hawaii, the Honorable Joseph Farrington. [Applause.]

Delegate FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, by way of introduction I want to explain some of the circumstances that brought about the formation of this committee and this visit to the islands, and particularly to Molokai.

The Committee on Territories of the House handles all legislation relating to the Territory of Hawaii. That includes, among other things, the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act. The committee as presently constituted is composed of some 24 men, all of whom, with the exception of two, I believe, have never so much as visited the Territory of Hawaii. It seemed very important to me, therefore, and in this sentiment the other members of the committee concurred, that as soon as possible a subcommittee should come to Hawaii for the purpose of informing itself generally on these islands, and of holding hearings on legislation pending before the committee. That legislation includes certain amendments to our land laws, on which we heard some testimony yesterday on Maui, and it includes statehood for Hawaii.

At the present time there is no legislation relating directly to the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act except a bill introduced originally

in the house of representatives here by Reuben Goodness, of Maui, which would transfer certain Territorial lands to the jurisdiction of the Homes Commission on Maui for settlement under the provisions of the act. However, I anticipate that now that the war is over that there will be changes in the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act brought before the committee. I know as a matter of personal knowledge that the commission has many changes in mind, and we have heard also that there is a definite prospect that the proposal to develop water for the homesteads be undertaken as rapidly as possible. I felt, therefore, it was very important that this committee take this time out of an extremely busy schedule in order to meet with you people so that they would know something about the character of the homesteaders and see the circumstances under which you are living, so that when legislation is brought before them they will not be expected to consider it in ignorance of the conditions.

The committee is composed of Mr. Larcade, of Louisiana, as chairman; Mr. Angell, of Oregon; and Mr. Delaney, of New York; Mr. Taylor, of New York; and Mr. Miller, of California. That completes the list of the five members of the committee, and I am serving with them.

At this particular meeting I am sure the committee will be glad to hear a statement from the members of the commission, outlining some of the problems that they anticipate bringing up before the committee, and I am sure the committee will also be glad to hear any homesteader that wants to be heard.

I want to make one request, and that is that you remember we have to be on our way very promptly, and by way of explaining that, I want you to know that each one of these men comes from a district in a State where he is under great pressure to serve his own constituents. They have come here at great sacrifice to themselves, as the veterans, labor, and business in their districts are pressing them to serve their local interests.

The President himself has been somewhat eager to have the Members of Congress back—Congress meets on next Monday, and we will not be able to be back in Washington for another week after that. I had hoped originally that they could stay here for 3 weeks, but it is impossible for them to do so. As it is, they feel that they are staying much longer than they really should, so all we can do is to get the essence of what your needs are, so that these people will be introduced to this problem, and we will have formed a basis for obtaining action.

Now, finally, I want to say that the special reason for this proceeding is that the Hawaiian Homes Commission is an act of Congress. The Government of the United States has a very definite responsibility for the administration of this law, and the Committee on Territories of the House has a particularly special interest in its administration. I think, Mr. Chairman, that covers what I had in mind when I arranged for this visit as part of our itinerary.

Chairman LARCADE. Do you have any further remarks to make in regard to the subject of statehood?

Delegate FARRINGTON. I think that after we have heard a preliminary presentation of some of the problems that will arise under the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, that the members of the com-

mittee would be glad to hear any sentiments that you care to express on the question of statehood.

There is a bill pending before the committee which is known as an enabling act, and whose adoption would set in motion the procedure by which we would become a State.

As you know, the legislature passed resolutions recommending that we be made a State immediately. The legislature likewise provided Territorial funds to defray the expenses of the Members of Congress who were invited here to study our conditions. The members of the committee are traveling under the provisions of that law.

More recently the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Ickes, has issued a public statement saying that as a result of his study he finds that we should be given the responsibilities of statehood. I know many of you voted in the plebiscite of 1940, and have given the subject a great deal of thought. Now that the war is over many of you feel we should get into this higher status at this time.

There is only one other person who is in the party that should be presented to you, and that gentleman is the counsel of the Department of the Interior, who is traveling with this committee as counsel, and he is Mr. Irwin Silverman.

Now I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the committee proceed first to hear the Chairman of the Hawaiian Homes Commission, or whomsoever he may designate to present the matters he may care to present to the committee.

Chairman LARCADE. We would be very glad to hear from that gentleman, or anyone whom he may designate, at this time.

Mr. FRANK H. WEST. My name is Frank H. West, and I am the Chairman of the Hawaiian Homes Commission.

A brief statement was handed to you gentlemen outlining the origin of the Hawaiian Homes Commission, the origin of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, and covering what has happened, generally, since the act became effective.

Chairman LARCADE. I would suggest, sir, that this statement be filed for the record. That will be considered a part of your presentation, and you may proceed with any other statement that you desire to make.

(Statement of Mr. Frank H. West, a brief of the Hawaiian Homes Commission, is filed, marked "Statement 9.")

Mr. WEST. I have no further statement to make, that I desire to make now, except to accent the absolute necessity of getting water on this island, if we ever hope to make this project an aggressive community for the Territory. The Hawaiian Homes Commission believes that there is an opportunity here, with water, to make this community a fine community, and a very valuable community within the economic set-up in this Territory, and it is recommended and has recommended that water be made available, and that funds be made available to get water on the island for irrigation. That is the only statement I have to make. If you want to know about the legal phase of this thing, we have Mr. Beebe here, and Mr. Houston also, who would be very glad to answer any questions you wish to ask.

Chairman LARCADE. There may be some members of the committee that might care to question Mr. West. Do any of the members of the committee desire to question the witness further?

Representative DELANEY. Just this one question: Are there any sites now owned by the Federal Government that could be turned over for homesteads that are more adaptable to small farms, or small farming, than the ones selected down here?

Mr. WEST. Well, there is a site on the island of Hawaii, at Waimea. You will probably see it when you get over there. It has already been designated as Homes Commission land. The Homes Commission is now studying that, with the idea of developing small farms. There are about 10,000 acres in that tract, I think, and probably a thousand or 1,500 acres would be suitable for small farming. But that site also would have to have water on it, to insure the success of it as a farming project.

Representative DELANEY. Is there any land owned by the Federal Government that you know of that would not need water?

Mr. WEST. No, sir.

Representative DELANEY. Every one of them would require water?

Mr. WEST. Yes, sir, as far as I know.

Mr. BEEBE. There is, however, water available on a site on Kauai. Is that not so, Mr. West?

Chairman LARCADE. We will give you an opportunity to be heard later, Mr. Beebe.

Mr. WEST. I did not include those lands in my statement, because, as Mr. Beebe says, while they are public lands, they have been leased for a considerable period to plantations over there.

Representative ANGELL. Are those part of the lands that came under the act?

Mr. WEST. Yes.

Delegate FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to bring out a few points.

On this formal statement that Mr. West has presented to the committee, on page 4, he outlines the major requests which the Hawaiian Homes Commission have made and will again make of the Territorial legislature. They include amendments to the Hawaiian Homes Act to allow a maximum loan of \$3,000 to homesteaders in residential areas; to allow a maximum loan of \$5,000 to homesteaders on agricultural areas; to allow each homesteader in agricultural areas a house lot not to exceed 5 acres and agricultural land not to exceed 35 acres. This to allow agricultural homesteaders to live in communities rather than scattered over the whole area; to provide for \$350,000 for the development of the domestic water system, and to provide \$3,000,000 for the start of an irrigation system [reading]:

These proposed requests will, it is believed, receive the favorite consideration of the Territorial legislature. If so, they will be finally determined by the Congress of the United States. It is hoped that that body will give them prompt and favorable consideration.

Now were those requests submitted to the last legislature?

Mr. WEST. They were, in 1943.

Delegate FARRINGTON. For the purpose of obtaining legislative approval and transmission to Congress. In other words, the legislature cannot amend the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act?

Mr. WEST. No.

Delegate FARRINGTON. In other words, the amendment must be made by Congress itself?

Mr. WEST. Yes.

Delegate FARRINGTON. Did the legislature recommend in favor of these requests, in 1943?

Mr. YATES. They did both in 1941 and 1943, in both sessions. The appropriation, however, is limited to $2\frac{1}{2}$ million dollars, and that is the figures that the commissioners included as the latest estimate, which is on a smaller project.

Delegate FARRINGTON. What I am trying to ascertain is if there is a record of the legislature having passed favorably on this proposition?

Mr. WEST. Yes.

Delegate FARRINGTON. All of them?

Mr. WEST. No; not all of them.

Mr. YATES. The water was not in.

Delegate FARRINGTON. What I want to know is: What requests were made to the last legislature?

Mr. WEST. The first three requests; the amendments to the act, were made, but at that time not followed up.

Mr. YATES. In the last session of the legislature they were not seconded, and were not acted upon.

Delegate FARRINGTON. In other words, the legislature failed in all these matters?

Mr. YATES. Yes.

Delegate FARRINGTON. That is the point I wanted to establish.

Mr. WEST. That is, with the exception of the larger water project, which as Mr. Yates says; they did pass an act authorizing the Commission to issue $2\frac{1}{2}$ million dollars worth of bonds.

Delegate FARRINGTON. Was that done at the last session?

Mr. WEST. No.

Delegate FARRINGTON. That was done in 1943?

Mr. WEST. Yes.

Delegate FARRINGTON. The reason I ask that question is, for the information of members of the legislature, that it is a common practice for the Territory's representative in Congress not to request congressional action unless the request comes from the legislature itself.

Mr. WEST. Yes, that's right.

Delegate FARRINGTON. And I do not recall having received any records covering any of these requests.

Mr. WEST. We did request the Governor to petition the legislature to allow us to float bonds to the amount of \$350,000, and that is out of a proposed bond issue of $2\frac{1}{2}$ million dollars, and to allow us to develop our domestic water system here, and that is the only action that has been taken since the last legislature, and we haven't heard anything from the Governor on that.

Delegate FARRINGTON. Well, with the war over, it is imperative, in your opinion, I assume, that some steps be taken to rehabilitate the homes of the people living up here?

Mr. WEST. Yes.

Delegate FARRINGTON. And to provide them with water?

Mr. WEST. Yes.

Delegate FARRINGTON. During the period of the war, the shortage of labor and material made it virtually impossible to do anything?

Mr. WEST. Yes.

Delegate FARRINGTON. To take those steps?

Mr. WEST. Yes, sir.

Delegate FARRINGTON. I would like you to clarify this: What can you do under the present laws to improve the water situation?

Mr. WEST. Well, we have a little money, which at this time amounts to about \$60,000, that we are allowed to use for permanent improvements, which includes water, and we used about \$80,000 last year to make what improvements we could on our local water system here, and the new public lands and so forth; that is all the money we have for permanent improvements, about \$60,000.

Delegate FARRINGTON. Now is that \$60,000 a year coming into permanent improvements?

Mr. WEST. Yes, \$60,000 a year.

Delegate FARRINGTON. To meet the requirements, which is inadequate?

Mr. WEST. Yes, it is inadequate.

Delegate FARRINGTON. It is really inadequate to meet the requirements of the people?

Mr. WEST. Yes.

Delegate FARRINGTON. Is there in the statutes of the Territory a law setting up a water authority, so to speak, for Maui County?

Mr. WEST. There was a law setting up a water authority under this act, to set up this 2½ million dollar bond issue, known as the Molokai Water Works.

Delegate FARRINGTON. Now can you outline that briefly, for the information of the committee, because as I recall it there is existing Territorial legislation against which Federal action can be taken.

Mr. WEST. I think Mr. Tavares here is very familiar with that, and he can probably tell us that.

Delegate FARRINGTON. Can you tell us about that, Mr. Tavares?

Mr. TAVARES. I am sorry, I did not quite get what was desired.

Delegate FARRINGTON. I want someone to give a brief outline of the steps taken by the Territorial legislature to provide an adequate water system and to qualify for Federal funds in this proposed program of irrigation. May I ask Mr. Tavares this, or if he does not have the answer ready it may be that Mr. Beebe will be able to answer the question—

Mr. TAVARES. Mr. Beebe is a member of the Commission and one of its lawyers.

This act allowed the raising of this 2½ million dollars by bonds, and also set up a water commission for Molokai—which was the Hawaiian Homes Commission—just why there was another name used for it I would not know.

Representative DELANEY. The personnel was the same, was it?

Mr. TAVARES. The personnel was the same; yes. That act passed the last legislature, and that is all there is to it, but nothing has been done since, for the reason that, as Mr. Beebe has pointed out, probably nothing could have been done.

Delegate FARRINGTON. Do you have the authority under that act to proceed with the development of the water system? What funds have you got?

Mr. TAVARES. We haven't got any funds until the Congress and the national legislature approves of the issuance of those bonds.

Delegate FARRINGTON. The legislature authorizes the issuance of how much?

Mr. TAVARES. It authorized \$2,500,000.

Delegate FARRINGTON. And was one of the conditions of that authorization that it should be accompanied by certain appropriations by the Federal Government?

Mr. TAVARES. No, sir.

Delegate FARRINGTON. In other words, it contemplates that the Territory would meet the cost of this project in full?

Mr. TAVARES. That's it.

Delegate FARRINGTON. And the Governor has not taken any steps to issue those bonds?

Mr. TAVARES. No.

Delegate FARRINGTON. The Commission has asked him to do so?

Mr. WEST. It has not asked him to issue the bonds in full. As I said, it did ask him to get permission to issue \$350,000 worth for our domestic needs.

Delegate FARRINGTON. There was a request made, though, and he has not acted on it yet?

Mr. WEST. No, no action has been taken.

Delegate FARRINGTON. Can you tell us what the reason is that the approval has not been authorized by the Governor?

Mr. WEST. I cannot tell you that. This request was sent to the Governor several months ago, and I haven't had any reply to it at all.

Delegate FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of these questions is to clarify the main facts of what is manifestly the principal problem before the Hawaiian Homes Commission on this project.

Mr. WEST. So far as any agricultural development is concerned.

Delegate FARRINGTON. Yes. And I wanted to do that for the benefit of the committee.

Chairman LARCADE. There is no objection on the part of the committee to establishing that, but I think we should continue with our procedure in the regular manner, and that questions be asked and the witnesses called in regular order, rather than having witnesses interrupt the procedure and make observations out of order, and that is why I would suggest, if it meet with the approval of the committee, that we invite Mr. Beebe to appear, and also the attorney general, and they could be questioned and those facts further developed. Is that agreeable?

Delegate FARRINGTON. That is agreeable to me.

Chairman LARCADE. Is there any other member of the committee who desires to ask any further questions of Mr. West?

(No response.)

Chairman LARCADE. Mr. West, I would like to ask you a question on the matter of statehood for Hawaii—for the Territory—and before asking that question, in order to further establish your qualifications as a witness to so testify, for the record I would be glad if you would give us a short synopsis of your background; how long you have been here and so on.

Mr. WEST. I have lived in the Territory of Hawaii since May 1915. I was engaged for several years in the contracting business here in the Territory and for the last 12 years I have been vice president

and general manager of the Hawaiian Cane Products, which company manufactures insulating board on the island of Hawaii.

Chairman DELANEY. I will now ask the question, and would like to have you state, if you so desire, how you stand on the matter of statehood for Hawaii.

Mr. WEST. My belief is that this Territory is ready for statehood, and should have it.

Chairman DELANEY. Are there any particular reasons that you would like to add to that statement, as to why you feel that the Territory of Hawaii is entitled to statehood, at this time?

Mr. WEST. Well, I think that the citizens of this Territory are capable of conducting a state under our form of government, and I think that the economics of the Territory more or less demand that we have statehood so as to enjoy equal rights with the rest of the States of the Union. The only reason I can think of why statehood might not be favorably considered out here is our distance from the mainland, and I think one of our big failures of this Territory has been in acquainting the mainland with our conditions out here, and every time I go to the mainland, which is quite often, I am astonished at the ignorance of the people, and of intelligent people, on the mainland, regarding all conditions in this Territory.

In the days of the first New Deal days, when they were organizing these codes and things, I was at Chicago at the time, at a meeting when the codes for insulation were being formed, and the matter of wages came up, and they decided on the wages in the North and the South, and then said that they did not suppose it was worth while to talk about the wages being paid by Hawaiian Cane Products, the general idea being that we probably gave our men a sack of rice a day, and that was their pay a month or day, whatever it was, and when I told them we paid our men more than our competitors were paying in the south why they did not believe me. When I was there on my last trip and was talking to an executive and he was a high executive in one of our larger firms back in the mainland, and he asked me, when we were talking about going over on the Clipper—he asked me how many stops the Clipper made between Honolulu and San Francisco, and so I say that I think the businessmen on the whole have fallen down greatly in the matter of acquainting the mainland with our conditions out here, and I am sure that everybody who comes out here from the mainland, that does not know anything about it, is astonished and surprised to witness the conditions under which we are living out here, and our set-up in this democracy.

Chairman LARCADE. You say you have been a resident of these islands since 1915?

Mr. WEST. Yes.

Chairman LARCADE. Would you be able to say, or be in a position to state to the committee what the general make-up of the population on this island is with respect to the various races, or racial groups?

Mr. WEST. On this island, I don't know. In fact, I don't know the make-up of the population on all the islands. I know a large percentage is oriental out here, or come from an oriental background.

Chairman LARCADE. About what percentage of the population is of oriental extraction?

Mr. WEST. I don't know. I think probably 60 to 75 percent, or not that much.

Delegate FARRINGTON. No, not that much. Those statistics are all in the record, and were given in Honolulu. I think the population on the island of Molokai is predominately, in fact, Hawaiian.

Mr. WEST. Yes; it is on this island.

Chairman LARCADE. That is what I am speaking of.

Mr. WEST. Oh, I don't think there is any question about that. I think they are predominately Hawaiian on this island.

Chairman LARCADE. Predominately Hawaiian?

Mr. WEST. Yes.

Chairman LARCADE. A native population?

Mr. WEST. Yes.

Chairman LARCADE. Any questions by any committee members?
[No response.]

Thank you very much, Mr. West.

The Committee would be very glad to invite Mr. Beebe to the Chair as a witness.

Mr. BEEBE. My name is Eugene H. Beebe, and I am an attorney in Honolulu, and a member of the Hawaiian Homes Commission.

One question was asked about the availability of land. I might preface my statement by saying that the Commission has heretofore met, with the idea that we might appear before you and has prepared a statement, and has set forth in that statement our views, and as therein stated the Commission feels very strongly that these projects having to do with housing have been eminently successful. (See Statement No. 9.)

This project, the Hoolehua project, has in some measure been successful, and it is rather difficult to say whether the lack of success has been due to lack of water. We do know that they do not get a crop, and by "crop" I mean potatoes, tomatoes, and things of that kind, more than once in 3 years, and over the last 2 years potatoes, corn, and so forth have been planted over here and the homesteaders did not recover enough from their crops when sold, if there was anything sold, to recover the cost of planting and the cost of seed. We agreed among ourselves that perhaps the most successful project for Hawaiians were projects close to the water, where they could have their house-lots on the water, with subsistence areas back from the water. Such an area is found at Anahola over on the island of Kauai. The last session of the legislature mandated to us to withdraw an area over there for the purpose of dividing it up into house-lots and subsistence homesteads. However, when we got over there we found that the area was in cane at the time the Hawaiian Homes Act became a law, and as a consequence under the language of the act did not come under the jurisdiction of the Hawaiian Homes Commission.

Now that is the only area of Territorial land that would necessitate a change in the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act by you gentlemen. There is ample water for the land. Of course it is an artificial system and so forth; it is not rain-water or anything like that, but there is enough water to take care of this area.

Mr. Delaney seemed to have asked questions about the fact that homesteaders could not get fee simple title to the lands up here. The

organic act provides that title to homestead land shall remain in the United States. That is, all we can do is to give a 99-year lease for the rental of \$1 a year.

Representative ANGELL. There are no taxes on it then, I presume?

Mr. BEEBE. Yes; it is taxed. The taxes go to the county.

Representative ANGELL. If the property belongs to the government, how is it taxed?

Mr. BEEBE. It is taxed.

Representative ANGELL. The act itself provides that the homesteaders pay the tax?

Mr. BEEBE. Yes, sir; the act provides that the title to the land shall remain in the United States—the land so leased.

Representative ANGELL. And does it provide it shall be taxed?

Mr. BEEBE. I believe so. I know it is taxed, and I believe there is authority in the Act for taxation. The taxes on real property, of course, go to the counties.

Chairman LARCADE. Mr. Farrington, do you have any questions?

Delegate FARRINGTON. I would like to ask the witness to outline, briefly, the provision of the law which set up the water authority for Maui. What is the main one?

Mr. BEEBE. The Molokai Water Commission, as I recall; section 12951 of the Revised Laws of Hawaii, which reads:

Molokai Water Board: There is hereby created the Molokai Water Board. The members of the Hawaiian Homes Commission shall constitute said board and shall serve without pay but shall be entitled to such reasonable traveling expenses as may be incurred in the discharge of their official duties, provided that when any member shall be required to travel from any island to another island of the Territory in the performance of his official duties he shall be allowed the actual cost of his transportation and, in addition thereto, \$10 a day to cover all other expenses.

The board shall appoint a manager and such assistants and employees as may be necessary for the proper performance of the Board's duties under this chapter.

The chairman of the board shall be annually elected by the members thereof. The board shall make an annual report to the Governor not later than the 15th day of February of each year.

Then the next section, 12952, provides for the powers of the board, reading as follows:

SEC. 12952. Powers: The board shall have the power to make preliminary surveys and engineering studies and to construct an irrigation and water utilization project, designed primarily to serve and supply the lands of the Hawaiian Homes Commission on Molokai and, in the event of the development of any surplus water over and above that needed for all purposes of such lands, to serve and supply owners or occupants of other lands on said island, and to manage, control, operate and maintain such project in accordance with the provisions of this chapter. It shall have the power to contract with the government of the United States or any bureau or agency thereof with regard to the construction or the financing of such system.

The board shall have power to fix, charge and collect water rates for service from such water system to defray the cost of operation, maintenance, and improvement of such system and to reimburse the cost of the construction and improvement of such system to the Territory. It shall also have the right to acquire by eminent domain, water and water sources either above or underground, water sheds, reservoir sites, rights of way over lands and property for paths, trails, roads, and landing sites, ditches, tunnels, flumes, reservoirs and pipe lines necessary or proper for the construction and maintenance of a system for conveying, distributing and transmitting water for irrigation and domestic use and for such other purposes as may properly fall within the scope of its activities in creating, managing, controlling, operating, and maintaining an irrigation and water utilization system. Such right of eminent domain shall be exer-

cised in the manner and under the procedure provided by law for irrigation corporations, with the additional right to enter into possession, provided by section 319. It shall also have such powers as may be necessary or proper to the full exercise of the powers hereinabove enumerated.

Delegate FARRINGTON. The Territory has provided the necessary legal authority?

Mr. BEEBE. That's right.

Delegate FARRINGTON. And the necessary financial authority for dealing with this problem?

Mr. BEEBE. That's right.

Delegate FARRINGTON. And, in addition, isn't there a provision in there for obtaining Federal funds if and when the project may qualify for them as a reclamation project?

Mr. BEEBE. I believe that is the case, I will read this paragraph from section 12955, under "Appropriation."

Any provision of this chapter or any other territorial law to the contrary notwithstanding, it is expressly provided that, in the event that it is found possible to secure Federal funds made available under any act of Congress to be expended in connection with or for the construction of the project authorized by this chapter, the board shall have the power to enter into such undertakings with the proper officers or agencies of the Federal Government, agree to such conditions, and do and perform such other acts and things as may be necessary, or be required by such acts of Congress or any regulations or requirements of the Federal Government, as a condition to securing such Federal funds for such project.

I think that is what you are referring to, Delegate Farrington.

Delegate FARRINGTON. Yes. That's all.

Mr. BEEBE. I might say, and I will be very brief, that in our various surveys around here we found that it would perhaps take \$7,500,000 to make water available, and of course people on Hoolehua cannot buy water under these circumstances. That is, the cost is prohibitive.

Representative ANGELL. What is the cost per acre for water? I would like to know the cost per acre.

Mr. BEEBE (to Mr. Ainoa). What were your figures, Dan, on the basis of \$7,500,000?

Mr. DAN AINOA. I don't recall right now, but it will run somewhere in the neighborhood of 50 cents a thousand—

Representative ANGELL. I am interested in the cost per acre.

Mr. DAN AINOA. Well, it will run somewhere in the neighborhood of about \$2.50 per acre per day for irrigation.

Representative ANGELL. That does not answer the question. My question is: Of the total cost of \$7,500,000, how much would be allocated to each acre?

Mr. AINOA. Well, I would not be able to answer that right now.

Chairman LARCADE. I would suggest that the witness be given an opportunity to supply that information for the record. (See Statement No. 38.)

Representative ANGELL. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BEEBE. There is plenty of water at certain periods of the year. Our hope was to put in a reservoir up there, and that was the reason that the request for the \$350,000 was made, so the people would be able to take a bath once a day at least, not once a week as they have had to do over the past several months.

Representative ANGELL. I believe you spoke about the crops, with respect to getting one crop about every 3 years?

Mr. BEEBE. Yes, that's right.

Representative ANGELL. How do those people live during the 2 years without crops.

Mr. BEEBE. Oh, they have worked in the pineapple fields during the last 3- or 4-year period.

Representative ANGELL. So they must make a living outside of their farms?

Mr. BEEBE. That's right.

Chairman LARCADE. Mr. Delaney, any questions?

Representative DELANEY. No.

Chairman LARCADE. Does any other member of the committee have any questions at this time?

Delegate FARRINGTON. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Beebe, would you describe the demand for water as desperate?

Mr. BEEBE. There is no question about it. I might say, Mr. Farrington, there were some malihini school-teachers who came down here this year and the best they could do was to take a bath once in 7 days, due to the shortage of water.

Chairman LARCADE. I would like to get an expression from you on the question of statehood. Are you in favor of it? Do you approve of statehood for the Territory?

Mr. BEEBE. I do.

Chairman LARCADE. Would you have any statement to make to the Committee as to why you favor statehood?

Mr. BEEBE. If I might supplement the statement: I have been down here 25 years, and I have been in both the House and the Senate of the Territory. I was born in Montana and raised in Washington. I have traveled around the United States quite a bit and know some of the Senators and Representatives that the State of Washington has sent to the Congress of the United States. I know that the people of the Territory are just as much able to govern themselves as are the people of the States, from my experience with the people of the States. I feel that we are entitled to the same representation in Congress that the people of the States are entitled to. That is my honest and firm opinion.

Chairman LARCADE. Does any member of the committee desire to question the witness on statehood? [No response.]

We want to thank you for your appearance.

Mr. BEEBE. I thank you for the opportunity of appearing.

(Mr. Beebe excused as a witness.)

Delegate FARRINGTON. I wish to present Mr. Victor Houston, who is a member of the Hawaiian Homes Commission, and who served as Delegate to Congress for Hawaii, for 6 years.

Chairman LARCADE. Mr. Houston, you may proceed.

Mr. VICTOR S. K. HOUSTON. My name is Victor S. K. Houston and I am a member of the Hawaiian Homes Commission. If there are any questions you would like to ask me, I am prepared to answer them. If you want a general statement, perhaps I can do that.

Representative ANGELL. Do you concur in the statements that were made by the other two Commissioners?

Mr. HOUSTON. So far, yes.

Representative ANGELL. Do you care to supplement those statements in any respect?

Mr. HOUSTON. I think I might. I notice this morning's paper carries a statement with respect to Mr. Delaney having expressed his fear that some of this legislation with respect to the Hawaiian Homes Commission having reference to the lands on Maui was class legislation. I do not know whether you were correctly reported or not, or whether you were of the opinion that it was class legislation. But assuming you did make the statement that it was class legislation, and hold such an opinion with respect to it, may I say that Hawaii and the people of the Hawaiian race are the only native peoples under the American flag that have not been taken care of by the Federal Government.

Representative DELANEY. Do you mean that statement?

Mr. HOUSTON. I mean that thoroughly. I will elaborate on it.

Representative DELANEY. In that statement you say they are the only ones who have not been taken care of by the Federal Government.

Mr. HOUSTON. Yes. That is a matter I might elaborate on, and say that on the mainland, on the continent, the Indians are taken care of by the Federal Government, or have been taken care of. In Alaska the Eskimos are being taken care of. In Guam the Chamorros have been taken care of, and in American Samoa the Samoans have been and are being taken care of by the American Government. Only in Hawaii the native race has never been taken care of by the Federal Government. None of the expenses with respect to the Hawaiian Homes Commission are paid for by the Federal Government.

Representative DELANEY. Do you feel they should be?

Mr. HOUSTON. I feel that there is a considerable debt and obligation, particularly since we are still a Territory, in tutelage, political tutelage and a political minor, and the past history has been to the effect that we haven't gotten the usual Federal aids that have gone to the rest of the political family unless the Delegate has been awake to the possibilities of the situation and has insisted, so far as he could, on getting language into the various bills making them applicable to the Territory; and many instances have gone by in which Hawaii has not benefited, and I think you are probably familiar with that situation. Federal aid for good roads was for a long time not applicable to Hawaii. Maternity aid was not paid to us for a long time, and the aid for educational institutions at the present time is not paid to us in an amount up to a par with the States, even at the present time.

Representative ANGELL. Your reference to the original people being taken care of by the Federal Government primarily had to do with giving them some favors as to lands?

Mr. HOUSTON. Yes, that was the reference of Mr. Delaney's with respect to that piece of land on Maui.

Representative ANGELL. The piece that was under discussion, and with respect to the land here now. Of course, as is generally known, and as you have stated, the Indians in the far west have had priorities.

Mr. HOUSTON. They have had some priority.

Representative ANGELL. They have had some rights to lands, and lands have been set aside and allocated to them.

Mr. HOUSTON. That is correct.

Representative ANGELL. And that is true in some respects to the inhabitants of Alaska?

Mr. HOUSTON. That's right. It may be of interest to recall this, that since we are political minors that some of the ills about which others are complaining, and more particularly with respect to the large element of Japanese ancestry, that it is only because of the fact that we were a Territory that it was possible for that large influx to come down here. It was because of the so-called "Gentlemen's agreement," that many thousands of Japanese came here, when the door had already been closed on the mainland. If we had been a State that condition would not have existed.

Representative ANGELL. Of course, originally the Hawaiians owned all of the land in these islands?

Mr. HOUSTON. That is correct. And when the division of lands was made, in 1849, between 1849 and 1855, known as the Great Mahele, the theory then, which was proposed by the teachers that came down here to lead the Hawaiians, you might say, that the division should be made one-third to the chiefs and the king; one-third to the Government, and one-third to the common people. As a matter of fact, when the division was completed, the king received his part and the chiefs received their part, amounting to 1,500,000 acres, and the Government had received about 1,800,000 acres, and instead of the common people getting one-third, which would have been about 1,500,000 acres, all they got was 22,800 acres.

Delegate FARRINGTON. What do you attribute that to?

Mr. HOUSTON. Well, a lack of interest perhaps, and to a condition wherein the people were not yet prepared for private tenure of land. They had never lived under conditions where they owned the land; they had merely occupied it.

Representative ANGELL. Is it the theory back of this legislation creating the Hawaiian Homes Commission to make some provision, at least, for the native Hawaiian so that they might share in some of these lands which originally were all theirs?

Mr. HOUSTON. That was one of the considerations. The other consideration was getting them out of the tenements to which they had congregated in urban areas and in which they lived under rather poor health conditions, resulting in a very rapid decrease of the race, as was testified to in Honolulu the other day. Because of the fact that the Hawaiian had been living in an isolated condition for so long, and not subject to the conditions under which other races were living, they had not developed that resistance to disease, so that when measles and smallpox and these other diseases of men were brought in, they just simply were wiped out. From a population that was estimated at the time Captain Cook came here to have been about 350,000 they were decimated down to the point where at one time, at the low-water mark, they had only about a little over 30,000 Hawaiian, and now they are beginning, thanks to this measure in part, they are beginning to come back, and of course it is largely due to the mixture of the people, but there are nearly 70,000 Hawaiian and part-Hawaiian now, so that you can see that there has been an improvement brought about by the more helpful measures that have been taken, the more healthful surroundings and the opportunity to live

on something which they might call their own, instead of being tenants.

Chairman LARCADE. Don't you think the Federal Government has made some contribution to that?

Mr. HOUSTON. The Federal Government has made no contribution, excepting the approval of the legislation; and if the Federal Government would make a contribution, of course, it might ease the situation, because there are many others here, naturally, as you can understand, who make demands for appropriations upon the Territorial government. Take, for instance, the matter of leprosy, which was spoken of also in Honolulu: it costs us now in the neighborhood of about \$800,000 every biennium to take care of our unfortunates here, whereas on the mainland every care for the lepers is taken care of by the Federal Government. As you know, at Carville there is a leprosarium, and when I was in Washington the Treasury at that time acknowledged their responsibility for the care of these unfortunates here, but said the budgetary requirements at that time would not allow the Federal Government to handle or make even a contribution towards their care here.

Chairman LARCADE. Does the Federal Government in any way participate in the running of the leper colony here?

Mr. HOUSTON. In no respect.

Chairman LARCADE. Do you favor Federal participation, or Federal funds, for that purpose?

Mr. HOUSTON. Yes; I do.

Chairman LARCADE. You realize that the Federal Government could then send lepers from Louisiana over here for their care? Or they could send them away from here.

Mr. HOUSTON. That is one of the reasons why the community did not support me in that particular attitude; but this danger is a little far-fetched, I think, as the difficulties of transportation would not make this a dumping ground for the mainland sick, and besides these unfortunates are just as gregarious as our people are; and it is bad enough to be sent from Minnesota, let's say, down to Louisiana for treatment—at least they can get into a jeep or jalopy and run down once in awhile to see them—but as for sending them across a water jump, then the opportunity to visit their people or have their people visit them is almost gone. It is bad enough here where they are on a little peninsula separated by a precipice from the rest of the island, and the Territory, and water jumps to the other islands.

Representative ANGELL. Were there any lepers here on the islands when Captain Cook came here?

Mr. HOUSTON. No, sir. That is a disease which probably came to us from the Orient. It is known in Hawaii as "mai pake" or "Chinese disease."

Representative MILLER. What is the average that you have to allocate over to the Federal Government for the maintenance?

Mr. HOUSTON. I haven't got that figure, but perhaps Mr. Silverman may have some knowledge of it. It is probably quite high.

Mr. SILVERMAN. I don't recall. It is, in my recollection, about \$200,000 a year, but I am not certain.

Representative TAYLOR. The population in the leper colony is decreasing?

Mr. HOUSTON. It is decreasing, fortunately, now, yes. That is due to better sanitation and to control. They try to find contacts of the cases, and then follow up the contacts and keep track of them, just as they do in tuberculosis.

Of course we do not know how leprosy is disseminated. The period of incubation varies from a few years to as much as 14 years, I believe. People who had returned from India to Great Britain and had not been in India for a period of about that time have developed leprosy, and of course the contacts in Great Britain were not to be suspected, but they had been in India and that is probably where they got it.

Representative DELANEY. Do you feel a strong argument in favor of statehood is the fact that the Hawaiian would be better taken care of under statehood?

Mr. HOUSTON. I feel that for us to remain in political tutelage is wrong, as you know.

Representative DELANEY. Do you feel that is a strong argument in favor of statehood?

Mr. HOUSTON. It is an argument, yes; and a strong one.

Representative DELANEY. You feel, do you, that it is a strong argument in favor of statehood?

Mr. HOUSTON. Yes. Under statehood we would have greater authority.

Representative DELANEY. And the further fact that you would be able to restrict the Japanese immigration?

Mr. HOUSTON. It would be restricted by the fact that we would then be a state. You see they can make exceptions for Territories. As a matter of fact, with regard to Filipinos, right at the present time, if the Governor certifies to the Secretary of the Interior that there is a need for labor other than such as is here, they can authorize the bringing in of a certain number of laborers, and at the present time there has been such a request and an approval of the request, for the bringing in of some six-thousand-odd Filipinos. That could not happen if we were a State.

Representative DELANEY. You have a representative form of government here, is that right?

Mr. HOUSTON. Yes.

Representative DELANEY. You have had it for some time?

Mr. HOUSTON. Yes, correct.

Representative DELANEY. With the consent of the legislature you are doing this, and without the consent of the legislature that could not happen if we were a State.

Mr. HOUSTON. That's right.

Representative DELANEY. And in spite of that you did bring them in here?

Mr. HOUSTON. Yes, that is correct. Do you want the reason for that?

Representative DELANEY. No, I don't want the reason. I remember. I know what the reason was.

Representative ANGELL. Any legislation you pass is subject to scrutiny by the Federal Legislature?

Mr. HOUSTON. Yes. Exceptions are possible now; they would not be possible under statehood, and to that extent we would be protected to a greater degree.

Representative DELANEY. Do you feel that that is your argument, that you are not able to take care of your own affairs; that you need Uncle Sam to restrict you on certain measures?

Mr. HOUSTON. We are looking for the application of the democratic principle of government, which is that there should not be any subsidiary or colonial establishments under the flag.

Representative DELANEY. Well, now, you are going into the territory of other islands and lands that may have been taken over in whole by the States.

Mr. HOUSTON. I don't know of any others.

Representative DELANEY. You don't know of any others?

Mr. HOUSTON. Not until recently. The Philippines have not been taken over.

Representative DELANEY. All right. Take Tinian, the Gilbert Islands, or any of those islands that have been taken by the government, now, eventually, if they apply for admission as Territories, or admission for statehood, do you favor that they should be admitted because of the democratic theory and rights that you just mentioned?

Mr. HOUSTON. We don't own them now.

Delegate FARRINGTON. I would like to ask a few questions in order to clarify a few of these matters. The same immigration laws already apply to the Territory of Hawaii as to the States, and have always applied to Hawaii, to this Territory?

Mr. HOUSTON. Absolutely.

Delegate FARRINGTON. And the immigration laws. The gentlemen's agreement to which you refer is not a law; it was an agreement?

Mr. HOUSTON. That is correct.

Delegate FARRINGTON. Under which the Territory of Hawaii was excepted?

Mr. HOUSTON. That is correct.

Delegate FARRINGTON. So they permitted the admission of picture brides?

Mr. HOUSTON. Not only picture brides, but male labor as well.

Delegate FARRINGTON. Up to 1924, when they passed the present basic immigration law, and that applied to Hawaii just as it did to every other part of the United States?

Mr. HOUSTON. That closed the doors specifically.

Delegate FARRINGTON. So that there is no immigration that can be allowed; that is beyond the laws of the Territory, except under this one provision of the Tydings-McDuffie law that you just referred to?

Mr. HOUSTON. That's right.

Delegate FARRINGTON. And that provision of the law expires on July 4, 1946, when the Philippines achieve their independence, does it not?

Mr. HOUSTON. I could not say for sure. I am of the impression that it is so.

Delegate FARRINGTON. I know that to be a fact.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I think that we should ask Mr. Houston if he favors statehood, and if it is not true that he has supported it and been in favor of it over a long period of years.

Chairman LARCADE. Yes. Will you please express your views?

Mr. HOUSTON. Yes, Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of statehood.

Representative ANGELL. At the present time?

Mr. HOUSTON. Yes, at the present time, Mr. Angell.

Chairman LARCADE. I know that the committee would be glad to have the witness testify at greater length, but we are about an hour and one-half behind our schedule, and I am quite sure that there are many things perhaps that he might want to bring to the attention of the committee, and I am going to ask the unanimous consent of the committee that at this point the gentleman be permitted to extend his remarks, or, if he prefers, to submit a separate brief.

Mr. HOUSTON. If you want me, I can be available in Honolulu, as I plan to return there, and could appear before the committee.

Chairman LARCADE. We would be very glad to have you do that, sir. Any other questions? (No response.)

Thank you very much.

(Mr. Houston excused as a witness.)

Chairman LARCADE. The Chair would like to announce that before and after the arrival of the committee that it has given public notice that any citizen who desires to appear before the committee to testify in favor or against any of the questions or problems which we are considering during this hearing are not only invited but are urged to appear before the committee, and at this time we wish to invite any citizen who desires to appear before this committee either for or against the questions that are being discussed at this meeting.

Is there anyone present who desires to testify or make a statement before the committee? If so, we will be glad to hear from them at this time.

Mr. MANASE MAKEKAU. I would like to appear and speak in reference to statehood. My name is Manase Makekau. I am for it every inch.

I have some figures here, some statistics on the population, which I would like to present to you:

Hawaiians, 14,246; part Hawaiians, 52,245; Puerto Ricans, 8,460; Caucasians, 139,299; Caucasian aliens, 2,328; Chinese, 24,886; Chinese aliens, 4,351; Koreans, 4,628; Korean aliens, 2,253; Filipinos, 18,050; aliens, 34,010; all others, 832; aliens 17. That makes a total of aliens of 42,959, which, deducted from 262,846, leaves a balance of 219,887 voters.

Japanese, 89,165 voters. Japanese are 124,351 total; aliens, 35,183; deducted, leaves 89,168. Now if you subtract 219,887, subtract 85,168 from it, it leaves a balance of 134,719 voters.

Representative ANGELL. That is on all the islands?

Mr. MAKEKAU. Oh, yes, I am talking of the Territory, and it takes about 10 years, I think, to consider the Japanese bloc vote. I have no fear of that. I say that now is the time to strike, when the iron is hot. When you go back we will all have to help to get this, and have to use your elbow grease, with respect to our being a State. Now is the age for it. Hawaii stands now in the center; in the center of thousands of miles of territory used to break the Japanese and it all comes under Hawaii, a big State. It involves, oh, millions and millions of men. I don't know the population of that. Oh, Honolulu, I love you, Honolulu. How long will it be? You are the queen of the ocean, and then the State of Hawaii will become the king of the ocean. Of course maybe the king of the other side. I don't know. Are there any more questions? That subject is covered.

Chairman LARCADE. Any questions?

Delegate FARRINGTON. I would like you to state for the record what your record has been as a public official? Have you served in any public office?

Mr. MAKEKAU. Oh, I did, yes. I was there making laws for many years; in 1909, 1911, and 1915, when I served in the house from West Hawaii, Second District.

Delegate FARRINGTON. In other words, you served as a member of our house of representatives?

Mr. MAKEKAU. Yes, and in 1931 and 1932 from the county of Maui.

Delegate FARRINGTON. May I ask how old you are, sir?

Mr. MAKEKAU. Well, I am 68, and I will be about 80. [Laughter.]

Delegate FARRINGTON. Were you born here?

Mr. MAKEKAU. No, I was born on Kauai, the Garden Island.

Delegate FARRINGTON. You are Hawaiian?

Mr. MAKEKAU. Oh, absolutely; every inch of it; 100 percent. And Kauai is an island that was never conquered.

Delegate FARRINGTON. That island, Kauai, was never conquered by King Kamehameha?

Mr. MAKEKAU. Never. Now if you want I can go back into ancient history, but time is passing now. Are there any other questions? We have to move along. Do any of you desire to ask any other questions?

Chairman LARCADE. We would like to take up most of the time here on this Hawaiian Homes project. We have gone into the population figures and so forth very exhaustively in Honolulu. If you want to appear later on, or file a brief, you will have the opportunity to do so. [See statement No. 26.]

Mr. MAKEKAU. No, that is all. I thank you. That is O. K.

Chairman LARCADE. Thank you very much.

(Mr. Makekau excused as a witness.)

ERNEST UU. My name is Ernest Uu, and I am a homesteader here on Molokai.

Chairman LARCADE. You may proceed with your statement.

ERNEST UU. I think the most important problem now facing the homesteader is water. If you recall, in the columns of the papers about 3 or 4 months ago, there was a drought here, where the water was rationed out, at the rate of about 6 days' supply being cut to 2 hours. I believe all of our homesteaders had a great shortage, and I know one of them had to go down to Kahanakakai and haul his water by truck. That is pretty bad. I have farmed for about 8 years, and I tried for about 4 years to put a crop in there, but it did not work out because of the lack of rain; and with no rain and no water it could not be done; I could not do anything.

The Commission will be wanting us to pay on the line for our loans, but we cannot do it because we have nothing to do it with, because the land does not produce. If the land does not produce, we cannot be able to pay our debts to the Commission, and we are therefore leaving ourselves open to be kicked out of the place, if we don't pay to the Commission our indebtedness, so as a homesteader I would like to appeal to you and this committee to help us. If your heart is with the Hawaiians then you will bring water into this land. I am quite sure that is our only salvation.

Representative TAYLOR. Have there been instances where homesteaders have been put off the land for failure to pay the Commission on their loans?

Mr. UU. There have been cases brought into court, but somehow it did not materialize; but they were reinstated, I understand. I think Mr. Julian Yates could verify that statement.

Representative ANGELL. Are many homesteaders behind in their payments?

Mr. UU. Yes, many of us are back in our payments.

Representative ANGELL. Those payments are for the improvements on the land?

Mr. UU. Not exactly for the improvements. There are other charges such as water rates, plowing, disking, and planting, and we use materials from the Hawaiian Homes Commission.

Representative ANGELL. But the land itself you get for a dollar a year?

Mr. UU. That is true.

Chairman LARCADE. Any questions, Mr. Delaney?

Representative DELANEY. No.

Chairman LARCADE. Does any other member of the committee desire to interrogate the witness at this point?

Mr. UU. We must have water.

Chairman LARCADE. How big is your homestead?

Mr. UU. Forty acres.

Chairman LARCADE. What are the annual charges on it for water, and for plowing and improvements, and all that sort of thing? How much are you required to meet a year, about?

Mr. UU. I pay just for water now, because I have my own equipment.

Chairman LARCADE. I would like to have all the elements. In other words, I would like to know how much money you have to figure on to meet monthly or annually—to take care of your expenses, other than your own personal living expenses?

Mr. UU. Well, my taxes run about \$38, yet they class unimproved land, because I am not planting now, because as I say, of the conditions, and if it is improved then I will be taxed proportionately, which I figure to take care of our homesteaders around the year it takes about \$400, plowing, planting and the taking care of the land.

Chairman LARCADE. About \$10 an acre?

Mr. UU. About.

Chairman LARCADE. What would the yield be if you got a crop?

Mr. UU. Well, if a crop comes out, if it comes out good, I think we should make about, say, \$1,200 a year clear, on about 20 acres of corn.

Representative ANGELL. When the crops fail you must make a living by seeking employment elsewhere, is that right?

Mr. UU. That's right. There is no way where the land could pay for itself other than existing contracts with the homesteaders planting pineapple, which now, I understand, they are paying \$70. Whether the contract is legal or not is beside the question; I don't know, because I did not sign the contract.

Chairman LARCADE. I would like to ask you: You have been born and reared here on this island?

Mr. UU. I was born and raised on Maui, and have been here for about 8 years.

Chairman LARCADE. Would you like to make a statement with respect to statehood for the Territory?

Mr. UU. I would like to do so.

Chairman LARCADE. Are you in favor of statehood for the Territory?

Mr. UU. Yes, I am in favor of statehood, because we are not gaining anything from being a Territory. Perhaps in some way if we get statehood we will be taken care of by the Federal Government, at least the Hawaiian race will be, or at least I hope so.

Chairman LARCADE. Is that the only reason you want it?

Mr. UU. That is the only reason.

Chairman LARCADE. Are there any questions by any members of the committee? (No response.)

(Mr. UU excused as a witness.)

Chairman LARCADE. Does anyone else wish to appear as a witness?

Mr. GUS L. NIHOA. My name is Gus L. Nihoa, and I am a homesteader. My statement is concerned with our indebtedness with the pineapple company. I am signed up on a contract with Libby, McNeill & Libby, and up to date the whole total with the block planting, the individual homesteader is really back two-thousand-two-hundred-and-some-odd dollars at the present, today. I would like to know if the homesteader is liable for the indebtedness on the loss of their planting. They prepare the land, they put the seed, pay for the seed, put the seed on the land and cultivate the land, and there is a loss on block 441 of about \$62,000—a loss, so that loss will be advanced to the following block for 442. Now they advanced that indebtedness to the block 443 just today. That is the situation today. So my question is: Are we liable for those indebtedness, as a homesteader? Are we responsible for that debt?

Representative DELANEY. Is that your only reason for testifying, to find out that answer, or is there something else?

Mr. NIHOA. Not only that, but as to every other homesteader, can they force us to pay our debts?

Representative DELANEY. That is a question for the Hawaiian Homes Commission, and on such questions you can consult the Attorney General, or we will be glad to have you consult with our counsel, who is from the Department of the Interior, who will give you the information you require on that. The Attorney General of the Territory is here.

Mr. TAVARES. I will be glad to do so.

Chairman LARCADE. Are you in favor of statehood?

Mr. NIHOA. To tell the truth, I could not say either no or yes, because I haven't made any kind of study to make a statement.

Chairman LARCADE. You haven't studied the problem sufficiently to make up your mind?

Mr. NIHOA. No; I don't know whether we would be o. k. or not, but if our representative here is in favor, and wants it, it makes me feel I would be in favor of it, too, for what us poor people could get by having statehood, as all we want is just a means of getting food and clothing. It would be good.

Chairman LARCADE. How long have you been on that homestead site?

Mr. NIHOA. Twenty years last November.

Chairman LARCADE. You were one of the first ones?

Mr. NIHOA. Yes. I was about the third one called, if I don't make a mistake.

Chairman LARCADE. How was the land when you first took it over; was it fertile land?

Mr. NIHOA. Not exactly. Of course my lot has gulches and so forth and so on.

Chairman LARCADE. Have you worked it?

Mr. NIHOA. Yes; I worked on my land; yes; I worked on my land, but with the assistance of the Hawaiian Homes Commission, in harvesting crops, diversified crops.

Chairman LARCADE. Was the water supply better then than it is today?

Mr. NIHOA. Well, naturally, yes, because I never remember a time since I have been on this land when there was a time we had to go 5 days without water, and then when you get water you are only allowed 2 hours of water, and whether it is sufficient or not; whether it could be done or not—you only get 2 hours' water. The water tank is filled up, if you have any kind of storage, then all right, but without storage it means that it is very hard for a family to get along. A man cannot take a bath after he has finished his labors. You cannot get along with that two hours of water, if you haven't got storage for the water.

Chairman LARCADE. Your lands are planted to pineapple?

Mr. NIHOA. Not just now.

Chairman LARCADE. Have you a loan to the pineapple company?

Mr. NIHOA. The pineapple company—of course in the early days we were under individual planting, and planted and grew pineapple on my land, and I helped grow the pineapple on my land. When the block system came, we all went into blocking.

Delegate FARRINGTON. And then the block system was taken over and operated by the pineapple people?

Mr. NIHOA. Yes; absolutely.

Chairman LARCADE. And what did they allow you for rental, or for your share?

Mr. NIHOA. Whatever the pineapples brought, I got a percentage.

Chairman LARCADE. After they were sold?

Mr. NIHOA. Yes, after the returns have been averaged.

Chairman LARCADE. What you are complaining about is that there has been a loss instead of a gain?

Mr. NIHOA. Yes; that's right. That is at the present time; with the present contract we have today.

Chairman LARCADE. That is a legal question that the attorney general should be able to advise you on, as Mr. Delaney has said.

We will be glad to have our general counsel and the attorney general of the Territory give you the information at a later date.

Mr. SILVERMAN. I might state for the record that the Department of the Interior has the problem before it, and we are looking into the question and will have a report.

Chairman LARCADE. Will you take the name of this witness, and see that he is supplied with that report?

Mr. SILVERMAN. Yes.

Mr. NIHOA. The next thing I have in my mind, as far as that is concerned, is our debt with the Hawaiian Homes Commission, as far

as cultivating our land in the past. There are many advances, new steps the Commission made when it comes on the land, and different adjustments, and charges which are different, and about taking care of the homesteaders' public debts. My information is, or what I want to know is: Can those debts be readjusted, these debts upon the accounts of the homesteaders?

Chairman LARCADE. That is a request for a legal opinion, and we will have a report for you on that, and you will be furnished with a copy of it.

Mr. NIHOA. Thank you.

Chairman LARCADE. Thank you for appearing before the committee. Is there anyone else present who desires to appear before the committee?

Mrs. MARIAN PETERS. My name is Mrs. Marian Peters, and my problem is the water situation, and just as in the case of the other two who spoke before me said, the water situation here is really very desperate. Until a very short time ago our water was rationed, and we would get only about 2 hours a day for water, for 5 days, over a 6-day period, anyway, and during the period of the war we were in Honolulu, and I came back here in July and at that time my storage tank was in very bad shape, so that I had nothing in which to put my water, and the 2 hours' period when the water was turned on, I would have to fill up containers, everything or anything, that held water, and storage that over 5 or 6 days, and of course it was inadequate, and I would have to borrow water from the neighbors. That was the situation with the water until very recently, when we had some rain, and in the meantime we put up tanks, and thus, with the rains, I am able now to get sufficient water for our needs, but that was the situation, and has been the case year after year, each summer, when there is always a drought; during the winter time there is enough water in the storage tank, our big storage tank, but not sufficient to carry over for the year, so that each year, for year after year, in the summertime, there has always been a drought, and there was always a shortage of water.

Chairman LARCADE. I think the committee is well apprized of this situation, and I am sure they are very sympathetic to your problem.

Mrs. PETERS. And another thing, just as Mr. Uu has testified, the land has not been productive, and we were not able to liquidate our indebtedness to the Commission. We were one of those who were asked to vacate, and our case has gone before the court in Maui, and there was nothing done about it at that time, and there was a recommendation from the deputy attorney general, who was here to represent the Homes Commission, that I was to return, so we returned home, and that he would recommend to the Homes Commission that we be reinstated, because there are others besides us who are indebted to the Commission, and nothing had been done, and so we returned, as I said, after a period of 3 years; we returned home, and we remodeled our house, and got settled down to stay here, and now there is a notice for us to go to court and that case is to be revived—the case of the eviction.

Chairman LARCADE. Of course that is a matter that comes before the Commission and the Territory.

Mrs. PETERS. The land has not been productive, and there is no water, and we are not able to liquidate it.

Chairman LARCADE. That fact has been disclosed by the previous testimony, and I want to assure you you have the sympathy of the entire committee in that respect, and I am sure that we will be glad to do anything we can to assist in solving this problem.

Representative ANGELL. May I ask one question? Does the situation you have described apply pretty generally to all the homesteaders, or just to a few?

Mrs. PETERS. You mean about the water?

Representative ANGELL. About producing crops, and being able to take care of expenses from the products?

Mrs. PETERS. It applies to everyone else.

Representative ANGELL. To all of them?

Mrs. PETERS. It is the same. That condition exists all over the homestead areas. It is the same thing everywhere on the homesteads.

Chairman LARCADE. Are there any other witnesses who care to appear before the committee? If not, the committee will now recess.

Delegate FARRINGTON. May I ask the unanimous consent of the Committee for the Attorney General to place in the record two paragraphs from the statute on the point of law relating to the taxes that are to be paid by the homesteaders, and providing that under certain conditions that the Commission may pay their taxes.

Chairman LARCADE. We would be glad to have that done, without objection.

(Copied from Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920; from the Revised Laws of Hawaii, 1945, p. 63; subsecs. 6 and 7 of sec. 208, and reading:)

SEC. 208 (conditions in leases).

(6) The lessee shall pay all taxes assessed upon the tract and improvements thereon. The commission may in its discretion pay such taxes and have a lien therefor as provided by section 216 of this act.

(7) The lessee shall perform such other conditions, not in conflict with any provision of this title, as the commission may stipulate in the lease: *Provided, however*, That an original lessee shall be exempt from all taxes for the first five years from date of lease.

Chairman LARCADE. Any citizen of this island who desires to submit any further testimony, or make a statement, may do so when this committee meets in Honolulu, where it will be in session from Tuesday through Thursday, and they will be glad to have anyone present any brief or further statements on the questions under consideration by this committee, at that place and time.

(The meeting adjourned at 1:45 p. m., January 12, 1945.)

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII

SUNDAY, JANUARY 13, 1946

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE TERRITORIES,
Konawaena, Hawaii, T. H.

The committee met at 4:05 p. m., Hon. Henry D. Larcade (chairman) presiding.

Present: Representative Henry D. Larcade, Louisiana, chairman; Representative George P. Miller, California, member; Representative Homer D. Angell, Oregon, member; Delegate Joseph R. Farrington, Hawaii, member.

Chairman LARCADE. The meeting will come to order. I will ask your Delegate to Congress, Mr. Farrington, who needs no introduction, to open this meeting.

Delegate FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission, ladies and gentlemen: I understand that this meeting was arranged for by Mrs. Richardson and Mr. Richardson at the request of Senator Eugene Capellas, who in turn was asked by the Governor to make some provision so that the people in all sections of the Island would have an opportunity to present their point of view to the members of this committee on the issues that it is faced with.

We have brought here today, therefore, the Chairman of our committee and two of its members, for that purpose. I might say, beyond that, that the committee's time has been very severely limited by the demands that are being made upon them from Washington. Each of the members came out here at a considerable sacrifice of his own interests, and we have had to squeeze into a 2 week's visit an enormous amount of work and an enormous amount of travel. We left Honolulu on Friday morning and went to Maui and spent Friday night on Maui, and yesterday morning we flew to Molokai and spent the morning touring the island, and after lunch we flew up to Hawaii. We were in Hilo last night, and this morning we left for Kona and we are here for this afternoon and this evening, and I know I express the sentiment of the committee when I say that we are all sorry that we cannot remain here longer; there is too much work to do, and not enough time.

The committee is a subcommittee of the House Territories Committee, and it is making this visit for the purpose of informing themselves generally on conditions in the islands, and for the taking of testimony on legislation pending before the committee relating to the Territory of Hawaii. That includes several changes in the land laws recommended by the Territorial Legislature, on which the Committee heard testimony on Maui, where the authors of the proposals, Senator Crozier and Representative Goodness reside.

The committee is also taking testimony on the subject of statehood for Hawaii, and a bill enabling the Territory to undertake the process by which it would become a State is pending before the committee.

The committee has heard extensive testimony in Honolulu on all the aspects of that question from witnesses on behalf of statehood and against; both the affirmative and the negative. We are now here presumably to take the testimony of anyone in Kona who desires to be heard on that question.

I desire now to introduce the members of the committee, and I will leave the chairman until the last, because I am sure he will want to make an introductory statement. On my right here is Congressman Homer Angell, of Oregon, and the gentleman on my right is Mr. George Miller, of California. Mr. Miller represents a district that is near San Francisco, Oakland and Alameda, and has within its confines the Crockett Refinery, and before presenting the chairman I want to say that he comes from the State of Louisiana, and has interests that are not unlike our own, and he is one of the most distinguished members of the House of Representatives, and came to that office after a very fine career within the State of Louisiana itself.

I will now present the chairman of our committee, Mr. Henry D. Larcade, of Louisiana.

Chairman LARCADE. Mr. Farrington, colleagues and ladies and gentlemen: I don't know whether I could add very much to the statements that have been made by our distinguished Delegate, except to reiterate that this is a subcommittee of the Committee on Territories of the House of Representatives of the United States, acting under authority of a resolution passed on April 30, 1945, directing and authorizing this committee to visit Hawaii for the purpose of holding hearings and investigating matters pertaining to the legislation under consideration by Congress, which is now pending in Congress, for action by our committee and the Congress.

I want to say that our presence here is due largely to the efforts of your Delegate. It just happens that he does not have a vote in the Congress, and as a result of that he makes no enemies at all. He doesn't vote for or against anyone, but regardless of that fact he has endeared himself very much to the members of Congress and has made many friends in the Congress. He is highly respected as a man of fine ability, and on account of his fine personality, and that is why he has been able to accomplish for the Territory almost as much as a representative could who voted in Congress. [Applause.]

It was, as I say, largely due to your Delegate, and through his efforts, that this committee was prevailed upon to come here, to make this visit, because, as you know, we are often in almost a continuous session, we have been so during the war. Congress only recessed on the 21st of December, which barely gave us enough time to reach our homes for the Christmas holiday, and the date for our return to Congress was set as of January 14, and, as stated by the Delegate, most of us really could have spent time that would have been of personal benefit to ourselves, from a political standpoint, because you know we have to be elected every two years, and there is an election coming up this fall for all of us. We really ought to be circulating around and mingling with our own constituents, and building up our political fences, and contacting them about problems which affect our

respective districts, and in addition to that we really should be back in Washington for the opening of Congress on tomorrow, because there are very many important matters which concern our country at this time, and our constituents are looking to the Congress to resolve them, because they are most serious and important, and the demands from the people of this country that our reconversion program get under way are most intense.

However, we have made this sacrifice, as I say, through the efforts of your Delegate, in order to give attention to the problems that confront this Territory, because when we accepted membership on the Committee on the Territories we assumed the obligation, which is to look after the affairs of the Territories. There has not been a committee that has visited the Territory since 1937, some 8 years ago, and naturally you have important matters that have to be given attention just like the rest of the States through other committees. Taking all of that into consideration, and especially the agitation for some action on the resolution that has been introduced into Congress by your Delegate with respect to statehood—I think that your Delegate has shown rare judgment in advancing this proposal at this time, and notwithstanding the fact that he had been working on the matter since last year, the recommendation of the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Ickes, has brought more attention to this question, and I think that his recommendation will have considerable weight and influence with many members of the Congress.

So this committee has come here since last week, and we have been holding meetings, and as announced previous to our arrival here the committee desires to give everyone an opportunity to present to the committee testimony and statements or briefs with respect to the matters which are being considered by this committee, and we have through the newspapers and through public announcements invited all persons to appear before our committee and testify who so desire, either for or against the measures that are being discussed at our hearings. In all the places we have visited we have had many citizens appear before our committee, and we are very glad to have this opportunity to visit your beautiful islands and to meet your people, and I want to say on behalf of the committee that we are intrigued with the islands and the people and the fine reception we have received, and we are very grateful because of the many courtesies that have been extended to our committee.

So with these preliminary remarks, if it is agreeable to the committee, we will now open the hearing and we will be glad to hear from any citizen who desires to appear before our committee, either for the purpose of making a statement in regard to statehood or against statehood, or such other matters as might be brought up at this meeting. [Applause]

Mr. Farrington, is there anyone who has indicated a desire to appear before the committee that you know of?

Delegate FARRINGTON. I will put that question to Mrs. Richardson. Have you the names of anyone who has expressed a desire to appear before the committee?

Mrs. RICHARDSON. No; I haven't any. I thought we would get together and discuss it. This is an unexpected meeting, and we were

just called together in a hurry, and we expected that witnesses would appear personally, and some I am sure are here.

Chairman LARCADE. May I ask you if you would care to make a brief statement on the subject of statehood for Hawaii?

Mrs. RICHARDSON. Yes.

Chairman LARCADE. And will you first state to the committee your background and what your office is as a public official.

Mrs. RICHARDSON. My name is Esther K. Richardson, Mr. Chairman, and I am a representative from west Hawaii, second district, and there has been some question of the privileges which we might have if we get statehood, and many of the questions that come out in the paper and that were answered through the paper. Probably our Delegate would give us a better description of his difficulties in Washington, as he has many times said in the paper—just briefly.

Delegate FARRINGTON. I might say in reply to that that we have given all that information to the members of the committee, and they are fully aware of my point of view. I think that they would like to know if you personally favor statehood for Hawaii.

Mrs. RICHARDSON. Yes.

Delegate FARRINGTON. You were born and raised in Hawaii?

Mrs. RICHARDSON. Yes.

Delegate FARRINGTON. And elected to the legislature in 1942?

Mrs. RICHARDSON. Yes.

Delegate FARRINGTON. And reelected in 1944?

Mrs. RICHARDSON. That's right.

Delegate FARRINGTON. As one of the four representatives from this district?

Mrs. RICHARDSON. Yes; there are four representatives.

Delegate FARRINGTON. That is all.

Chairman LARCADE. Would you have any further statement to add to what you have said, or would you have any reasons to give why you think it would be a benefit for the Territory to become a State?

Mrs. RICHARDSON. Only through what our Congressman has told us.

Chairman LARCADE. Any questions by members of the committee?

Representative MILLER. We have heard a great deal about bloc voting, or of what is known as bloc voting. If this Territory becomes a State it is said there is some fear of local elections being influenced by bloc voting. Do you feel that there is such a thing as racial bloc voting? Do you think it is the menace that it is set up to be, or does it actually exist?

Mrs. RICHARDSON. Well, I really don't know. I am really new at politics, and they talk about it, that is all, I know that, but I don't think there is. I have no idea, because people don't do that here, and then you cannot say they are bloc voting. That is something I cannot say.

Representative MILLER. You don't think it takes place in this second district, which is the one, I believe, you represent? Does bloc voting take place in your district?

Mrs. RICHARDSON. I don't think it does here.

Representative ANGELL. Different people in your district take an active interest in political questions?

Mrs. RICHARDSON. Yes; they do.

Representative ANGELL. And how extensively do they vote; those who are qualified to vote?

Mrs. RICHARDSON. Well, we have about 2,300—I am not quite sure about the figure—but the registered voters here are around 2,300, if I am not mistaken, and they all show an interest as to who they want to represent them at the legislature or for our board of supervisors in Hilo, which all shows that they are very much interested as to who is sent there.

Representative ANGELL. What percentage of the 2,300 exercise the privilege of voting in elections?

Mrs. RICHARDSON. All of them do. That is, all who have a registered vote.

Representative ANGELL. They don't all vote, do they; all that register, do they?

Mrs. RICHARDSON. Well, it is almost 100 percent, when you come down to voting.

Representative ANGELL. How do you conduct the political campaigns in your district?

Mrs. RICHARDSON. Well, we just travel from one district to another, and I do not know whether you do the same thing in the mainland, but there are arranged meetings that we go to.

Representative ANGELL. The meetings are arranged for ahead of time?

Mrs. RICHARDSON. Yes; that's right.

Representative ANGELL. And they are pretty well attended?

Mrs. RICHARDSON. Yes.

Representative ANGELL. Do both candidates, on the Republican and Democratic ticket, go out together, or go separately?

Mrs. RICHARDSON. Well, we go separately, but we do have the meetings the same place, just at different hours. We probably have our meeting at 5 and they have theirs at 6, but we go right along by ourselves.

Representative ANGELL. And do voters of both political parties attend both of the meetings, both the Democratic and Republican meetings?

Mrs. RICHARDSON. Yes.

Representative ANGELL. Do you do any campaigning by radio?

Mrs. RICHARDSON. Not here in the third district. They do in the second district; west Hawaii, we do not do it that way.

Representative ANGELL. Do you advertise in the newspapers?

Mrs. RICHARDSON. Yes; we do.

Representative ANGELL. You have printed cards that you distribute?

Mrs. RICHARDSON. Yes; we do.

Representative ANGELL. Then of course you have your platforms and principles for which you stand?

Mrs. RICHARDSON. That's right.

Representative ANGELL. Do the voters evidence a strong interest in the various problems that concern the people?

Mrs. RICHARDSON. Yes; they do.

Representative ANGELL. What is the situation with reference to the educational facilities in your district?

Mrs. RICHARDSON. Well, I think the standard of education in the Territory is very high, according to my calculations.

Representative ANGELL. Do all of the children learn to read and write English?

Mrs. RICHARDSON. Yes; they do.

Representative ANGELL. Are they required by law to attend schools?

Mrs. RICHARDSON. Yes.

Representative ANGELL. Have you had any experience with educational facilities on the mainland?

Mrs. RICHARDSON. Well, only what I have heard from some of the teachers from the mainland that have been to our meetings.

Representative ANGELL. Does that lead you to believe that your educational facilities here are as good, if not better, than on the mainland?

Mrs. RICHARDSON. I was told that it is far better than in some of the States; that our educational system and educational standards here are far better than in some of the mainland States.

Representative ANGELL. When the young men were called into service there were many, many thousands on the mainland who were found to be unable to read or write. Did you have that same experience here in the Territory?

Mrs. RICHARDSON. I think 90 percent of the people here are able to read and write. It is only the aliens that came here that would not be able to read and write; they are learning, though.

Representative ANGELL. What is the fact as to whether or not those people are interested in religious movements and in religious organizations?

Mrs. RICHARDSON. Yes, and we have many denominations here, so that there is no restriction.

Representative ANGELL. Are many of them affiliated with some church organization?

Mrs. RICHARDSON. That's right.

(Mrs. Richardson excused as a witness.)

Chairman LARCADE. Is there any citizen who desires to appear before the committee at this time?

Delegate FARRINGTON. I suggest we have a brief statement from Mr. Francis Aona, who is another representative from this district.

Mr. FRANCIS K. AONA. Francis K. Aona is my name. I have served in the Territorial legislature now for over 20 years. There was a statement made here, and also I have been asked by some of your Congressmen, in reference to bloc voting. I want to clear up that question about bloc voting. Six years ago there were a number of Japanese, or being of Japanese ancestry, who were running for representative, and at that time there was a war going on between Japan and China, and statements went out among the older Japanese that the Chinese voted for the Chinese and the Japanese voted for the Japanese, and the Chinese in this district here you can count with your fingers—it is very small, but in spite of that, and although at that time there were three Japanese boys, and there were three part Chinese, and I was one of them—and Akina, Akao, and myself, but the vote did not show up that way, and we beat the Japanese in spite of the number of Japanese voters here, and we got almost or close to 75 or 80 per cent of the Japanese vote; they did not vote for their Japanese candidates, and as I said a little while ago the statement went out that the Japanese would vote for the Japanese and the Chinese would vote for the Chinese, but the Japanese

did not vote for the Japanese, so it proves there cannot be any bloc voting here.

Chairman LARCADE. Is that generally true over the entire Territory?

Mr. AONA. Well, I think so; that it is in all the Territory.

Chairman LARCADE. Does any member of the committee desire to question Mr. Aona on this particular subject?

Delegate FARRINGTON. Do you know, from your statement, that there is no bloc voting in this district?

Mr. AONA. Yes, and not only in this district.

Delegate FARRINGTON. This is the one you are the most familiar with.

Mr. AONA. I think I am also familiar equally with Honolulu, because I spend quite a little time there; I just came from Honolulu this morning.

Delegate FARRINGTON. Mr. Aona, would you object to telling us something of your background, your ancestral background and your history?

Mr. AONA. What do you mean by "background"?

Delegate FARRINGTON. I mean your racial ancestry, and where you were born.

Mr. AONA. I was born at Kailua.

Delegate FARRINGTON. That is right down here below where we are, on the sea?

Mr. AONA. Yes. That is about 13 miles from here. By July of this year I will be 53 years old, and as I said a little while ago I served over 20 years in the legislature, and I served in the Territorial legislature as far back as 20 years ago; that was at the first special session and I served two sessions, and since 1939 I have been in the legislature and up until this day, and I have been serving as chairman of the committee on education and agriculture, and a member of the finance committee, and so, of course, at this present day I may say that I am not a 100 percent politician, that is, every day, but when the time for politics comes I am like a fireman, and when the bell rings I am ready and raring to go, but just now I am not thinking about it, but when the time comes I am ready to do my running. Just now I am rather slow about it, but like a fire horse, when I hear the alarm, when the bell rings, no matter how old I am I am ready to start off, and it is the same with me as it is with an old fire horse.

Delegate FARRINGTON. You are part Hawaiian?

Mr. AONA. I am part Hawaiian. My father is pure Chinese and my mother is Hawaiian, and I was told I got a little bit Spanish in me, and I remember when I was a little kid I got kinky hair, and maybe that is the reason why I want to travel back and forth all the time.

Representative ANGELL. Do you favor statehood for Hawaii?

Mr. AONA. I think I have got to be in favor of statehood. I voted for it at a couple sessions of the legislature, and I thought I would keep away from saying anything about it, whatever way it may be they cannot blame me, and the chairman said he should be back where his district is, looking for votes, and I thought in the meantime I better stay back behind the fight, and if conditions are ready for statehood why I will vote for statehood, but, vice versa, I vote the other way. As this district down here is so small, I thought I would play safe.

Chairman LARCADE. That is good politics, all right, but I had hoped you would be able to give us a definite statement describing what you

thought about statehood; whether or not it would be good for the Territory, and what benefits would accrue to the nation.

Mr. AONA. One thing I think would be good for the Territory, Mr. Chairman; at least we would have two Senators who would go to Congress, and three Congressmen with some voice in what is going on. Our Delegate, of course, has no voice and no vote, except probably by the way he presents himself to Congress, and by making efforts and by that means getting things here for the Territory, and I think if we have statehood at least we will have a couple of Congressmen and a couple of Senators and who probably can procure something for their districts.

This is one of the smallest districts, and we have the smallest voting power, and we are the lowest when it comes to paying taxes, and when the legislature is over this little district gets more than its share, and maybe it would be the same thing here; we would probably have two Senators from the Territory, and only three Congressmen, and if we sent three Congressmen and two Senators we might be able toicker with the rest and come back with the bacon for the Territory.

Chairman LARCADE. Then you would have a better standing there?

Mr. AONA. I think so.

Chairman LARCADE. Any questions by the committee?

Representative ANGELL. What is your occupation, if I may ask you?

Mr. AONA. Now?

Representative ANGELL. Yes.

Mr. AONA. Well, I will tell you about that. I am supposed to be a bootlegger because I am in the liquor business. I have got a little ranch up here, and I have a night club, and I have got a hula troupe where the hula girls shake it up all the time, and I am also in real estate, and I am in a number of enterprises. I am a businessman.

Representative ANGELL. You mentioned that you are on the educational committee in the Legislature. What are your views with reference to the general standards of education?

Mr. AONA. I think we have about the best that you have got on the mainland. I think we should be more than proud of what we have here.

Representative ANGELL. Do the children go through grammar school and follow on right up through high school?

Mr. AONA. Yes, I think so. I think we have, on the whole, as Mrs. Richardson said,—I think we have a large number of people here than elsewhere who know how to read and write, and as I said a little while ago, we are proud of what we have here in education, and I think our people here can do better in putting down things with a paper and pencil, although it is true they can do a lot of talking, but I do know when they come in the store and when you turn over a piece of paper and a pencil to them and you say "You write it out,"—after you have failed to understand them, if you give them a pencil and paper I guarantee that they can write it down; probably not being able to speak the language as well as an American can speak it, but one thing I can guarantee, with anyone here, if you give them a piece of paper and give them a pencil, I guarantee you that they will write, but I know a lot of your American people, soldiers, and others, that enter the bar, sometimes they talk, and when they talk it seems they know everything and own the whole world, but turn a pencil and

paper over to them,—no score. So that is why I said our educational system here is probably as good as it is on the mainland.

Chairman LARCADE. Any other questions? [No response.]

(Mr. Aona is excused as a witness.)

Mr. SHUNZO USHIRODA. My name is Shunzo Ushiroda.

Delegate FARRINGTON. Where were you born and raised, Mr. Ushiroda?

Mr. USHIRODA. In Kona here.

Delegate FARRINGTON. And you have lived here all your life?

Mr. USHIRODA. Yes.

Delegate FARRINGTON. At the present time what is your occupation?

Mr. USHIRODA. Oh, I am a storekeeper, and a district court practitioner.

Delegate FARRINGTON. You served in the legislature?

Mr. USHIRODA. Yes, in the 1933 session, for one term; one regular term, and we had a special session.

Delegate FARRINGTON. Did you stand for reelection?

Mr. USHIRODA. I did not.

Delegate FARRINGTON. Will you give the committee something of your educational background? I am merely asking these questions as I thought it would be of some interest to the committee to see an American of Japanese ancestry who was born and raised in this district and who lives here and makes his home here, and I am sure they are interested in hearing something of your background and of your public service.

Mr. USHIRODA. Well, I haven't had much education. I only finished 1 year of high school, and then my parents were poor and I had to quit school and then start working, so my first work was as assistant bookkeeper down in the little sugar mill we had in this Kona district and I stayed there for about 17 months, and then I was employed in the bank as a clerk, and I stayed there for 6½ years. From there I was assistant to the tax assessor here for 7 years, and while I was in the bank we had a lawyer by the name of H. S. Middleditch, and I studied a little law under him, and finally got my license to practice in the district courts; that is the so-called police court, as it is usually referred to in some places. Then I have a little store down the line here, and I was also connected with the Hawaii County police department for a period of 9 years; I started in as an investigator, in charge of prosecutions, and then got promoted to deputy sheriff of this district, and then when the police commission form took place, I was given the rank of lieutenant of police, under the new police commission set-up, and I held that until January 31 of last year, when I resigned in order to take care of my store, because my third son was inducted in the Army and he was running the store; and I had nobody to operate the store, so I had to resign from the police department; the police job.

Delegate FARRINGTON. How many sons do you have, or did you have in the service?

Mr. USHIRODA. Three sons.

Delegate FARRINGTON. Where did they serve?

Mr. USHIRODA. The first one went to Camp Shelby first and from there up to Camp Savage.

Delegate FARRINGTON. What unit was he with?

Mr. USHIRODA. He was in the infantry at first, and then he went over to the intelligence school, and finally went up in Warrenton, Va., in the Signal Corps. My second son is also in the Infantry. He is now at Fort Snelling, in the language school over there, and my third son is with the Air Corps up in Iceland.

Delegate FARRINGTON. The Kona district here—is it generally true that the proportion of the population of Japanese extraction is relatively large here in the Kona district?

Mr. USHIRODA. Yes.

Delegate FARRINGTON. Much larger than it is elsewhere?

Mr. USHIRODA. Yes.

Delegate FARRINGTON. You have had a good deal of experience in practical politics in this district. Will you tell the committee along what lines they divide; whether they divide along party lines, or whether or not you have any competition among others than Japanese-Americans when you stood for election?

Mr. USHIRODA. Well, you are referring to bloc voting, I suppose?

Delegate FARRINGTON. Yes.

Mr. USHIRODA. Well, there is no bloc voting, as far as I know, because we have had candidates of Japanese ancestry, several of them, running, and maybe one would get in, and the others will be defeated, and now if the Japanese voters voted in bloc for those candidates I would have thought that they stood a better chance of getting in, instead of being defeated. It all depends on the caliber of the person that is running, whether he be of Japanese, Chinese, Hawaiian, or any other race.

Delegate FARRINGTON. That's all.

Representative MILLER. Who owns the land in this section you live in?

Mr. USHIRODA. Most of the land here is owned by large holders; I think the Bishop estate is the largest one.

Representative MILLER. Are there many small homesteads?

Mr. USHIRODA. Well, comparatively few, I would say. Most of these people have leased lands.

Representative ANGELL. Do your sons read and write Japanese?

Mr. USHIRODA. Well, two of them now, I think, can write fairly well, but the others are not much good; in fact they have a hard time to write their own name.

Representative ANGELL. Are schools maintained for the study of Japanese?

Mr. USHIRODA. Not now. It was up to the time of the war.

Representative ANGELL. Are there any papers published in Japanese in this district?

Mr. USHIRODA. No.

Representative ANGELL. Do those of Japanese extraction segregate and live in a community together, or do they intermingle with the whole community.

Mr. USHIRODA. They intermingle from one end of the district to the other, and the men are engaged in coffee farming and have 5- or 10-acre pieces of land, and have a house on it, and next door there may be a Filipino or it may be a Japanese, and so forth, on down the line.

Representative ANGELL. Do they attend civil and social functions together with all other racial groups?

Mr. USHIRODA. That is, the second generation do.

Representative ANGELL. There are quite a large number of different racial groups in this community here, are there not?

Mr. USHIRODA. There are quite a few, but the total population is rather small.

Representative ANGELL. Now in any of the racial groups are there segregations, where they tend to live together in this community, or do they live together with all the other groups?

Mr. USHIRODA. All intermixed here and there; they are all intermixed.

Representative ANGELL. What are your views on statehood?

Mr. USHIRODA. I am in favor of statehood.

Representative ANGELL. For what reason?

Mr. USHIRODA. So we will have a little more voice in Congress.

Representative ANGELL. Any other reason?

Mr. USHIRODA. And we would be able to elect our own government, I believe.

Representative ANGELL. Having been a member of this Territorial legislature, it is your view that the Territory is fitted both economically and with reference to the character of its people to maintain their own government as a separate State?

Mr. USHIRODA. I believe so.

Delegate FARRINGTON. In reply to a question by Mr. Angell you said that two of your boys are now able to speak Japanese. Is it not true that they were taught Japanese by the American Army?

Mr. USHIRODA. Yes, in this intelligence school, at Fort Snelling.

Delegate FARRINGTON. Prior to that their knowledge was extremely limited?

Mr. USHIRODA. It was very limited prior to their entry into the Army.

Delegate FARRINGTON. And normally, in your home, do you speak English?

Mr. USHIRODA. Yes.

Delegate FARRINGTON. They were taken into the intelligence service and had to be taught the Japanese language?

Mr. USHIRODA. Yes, all over again.

Delegate FARRINGTON. In order to be used for that purpose?

Mr. USHIRODA. Yes.

Representative ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, may I ask one additional question: In most of the homes of people of Japanese extraction, of the second and third generation, is the conversation carried on almost exclusively in English?

Mr. USHIRODA. In English.

Chairman LARCADE. Are there any other questions of this witness? [No response.]

(Mr. Ushiroda excused as a witness.)

Chairman LARCADE. Are there any other citizens who desire to testify?

Mr. DONALD F. BOWMAN. My name is Donald F. Bowman, and I am a retired executive of the Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association. I have lived in the Territory for 46 years. I am for statehood absolutely. I think we are ready for it, and I think that we have been

a stepchild of the United States Government long enough, and that we are entitled to be adopted into the family of States.

There are a number of things that I have jotted down here that came up. I believe we have in every way responded to all calls made upon us by the United States Government. I think that has been brought out at the various meetings, at various times. I would like to point out that our voters are almost 100 percent literate, and the people at large, except for the aliens—practically all the people born in the Territory of Hawaii are literate, or a very large percentage of them are. I spent last year on the mainland, and I put in some time in southeast Missouri and Arkansas and Tennessee, and I believe that we are much more literate here than they are in those southern States.

Chairman LARCADE. May I interrupt?

Mr. BOWMAN. Yes.

Chairman LARCADE. Is it your opinion that when the question of plebiscite was held, with regards to the question of statehood for the Territory of Hawaii, that all of those who participated in that election were aware of what they were voting for or against?

Mr. BOWMAN. I believe so. I believe the majority were, at least; say 95 percent of them.

Chairman LARCADE. Thank you.

Mr. BOWMAN. I would like to point out that our citizens of Japanese ancestry are no different from the citizens of the foreign-born on the mainland; that is, the descendants of the foreign-born. In other words, our citizens here of Japanese ancestry cling to some of the culture of the Japanese aliens, very much like the Italians in New York take up the culture of the Italians that immigrated, and the Poles take up the culture of their people; and the Germans, for instance, in Missouri, where we have large sections of that State that are populated by immigrants from Germany, and their children speak German, and they had German schools, and German priests, and the second generation practically all speak German now—and the third and fourth generations, of course they are getting away from it, and that is what has occurred here; the first generation they came a little closer to the Japanese, and the second generation get a little further away, and the next a little further away, and so on.

Now bloc voting, I think, is a myth. I don't believe there is anything to it, because I have voted in Honolulu, and voted in Hilo, and I have been over here at election times, and whites, Portuguese and Hawaiians have been elected in very strong Japanese districts. That is, when I say "Japanese" I mean the descendants of the Japanese. And likewise, Japanese have run in districts like the district of Puna, for instance, or some other place, that is largely populated by Hawaiians, and they have been elected, and I think all the way through—I don't think there is anything to this bloc voting.

It is true that occasionally in some elections there is some blocing for a certain candidate, but they may be of any nationality. I think that is true throughout all the other islands, and I believe that if we had statehood that this would be a better community, and that we would be better represented in Congress, and we would get a little more of what is coming to us.

I think that in the years gone by that we have been rather neglected by Congress. We have been excluded from a great many acts that are beneficial to the States, and it is only through the superhuman efforts of our Delegate that Hawaii has gotten any benefits.

Chairman LARCADE. Are there any questions?

Delegate FARRINGTON. I would like to state for the record, Mr. Chairman, that Mr. Bowman's long experience in the field of welfare work has given him an extraordinary opportunity to observe the people of the Territory in all their activities, and in addition to that that he is in retirement now, and in a position to speak with absolute independence, and I believe his testimony should carry a lot of weight, and he is very highly regarded by the people in the Territory and has an exceptionally fine family.

Mr. BOWMAN. I might say that although I was employed by the Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Co. for over 20 years, that I am not related by blood or marriage with any executive of any corporation. I am a rank outsider.

Chairman LARCADE. That seems to be of interest to some people.

Mr. BOWMAN. Yes.

Representative MILLER. Do you think the people of the Territory and the descendants of the immigrants here meet on an equal basis, and that the prejudices that are supposed to exist are more or less mythical, too?

Mr. BOWMAN. I think so, yes; I think so.

Representative MILLER. If the Kona High School is playing football against another high school on the island, the students who are of Japanese ancestry are going to go and root for their team as against the football team of the other high school who may be of other ancestry; they would root for the school, rather than for the nationalities?

Mr. BOWMAN. They are just as apt to root for the Hawaiians as for the Japanese, regardless of what school they attend. There is no distinction.

Representative MILLER. In other words, they are just American citizens?

Mr. BOWMAN. That's right, as if their home was in New York, Pennsylvania or any other State; they are just good American citizens.

Representative ANGELL. I might ask one question: It has been brought out that you have had experience with welfare work. In your judgment, what is the moral standard among the people of the island compared with the States on the mainland?

Mr. BOWMAN. I would say it is just about equal, if not a little bit higher. Now I base that on the fact that I lived a year on the mainland, last year, and I have lived down in Arkansas and Tennessee and Missouri, and from what I saw there I think that our standards are very high here.

Representative ANGELL. As to delinquency among the children, and that sort of thing, what are the standards and what is the situation?

Mr. BOWMAN. I think that is very well handled here. I think when there is delinquency there is rather a tendency to overplay it, because we are so anxious to improve, and we want to bring everything out in the light.

Representative ANGELL. Does the Boy Scout organization exist in Hawaii; in this Territory?

Mr. BOWMAN. Oh, yes, it is very active.

Representative ANGELL. How extensive is it throughout the Territory?

Mr. BOWMAN. Well, I believe we have Boy Scouts in practically every district in all the Islands. I know my boys were Boy Scouts in Honolulu.

Representative ANGELL. I am personally interested in that, having been on the board in my local community for 27 or 28 years. We have found that the boys who affiliated with that organization or similar organizations became better citizens, and were able to discharge the duties of citizenship much better when they reached manhood, and particularly in respect to the military service, and that has been the situation for many, many years, and rarely are Boy Scouts found in the juvenile court.

Mr. BOWMAN. I believe that is very true on the mainland, and here also.

Representative ANGELL. And different racial groups, or the children from the various racial groups, all affiliate with the Boy Scouts and similar organizations?

Mr. BOWMAN. Oh, yes, they do.

Chairman LARCADE. Are there any questions by members of the committee? (No response.)

Thank you, Mr. Bowman. Are there any other witnesses who wish to be heard?

G. HOWARD BARRETT. My name is G. Howard Barrett. First of all I would like to say I had a very special reason for appearing, because Mr. Angell happens to come from my home State, and I would like to add further that my heart is in Hawaii, since I married an island girl, and I plan to live here.

I am at present engaged in the public schools of the Territory of Hawaii.

I should like this to go on the record. It was with a great deal of contemplation I considered appearing before this group, because I am a particular kind of a person, one that has a conscience, and that conscience sometimes puts me on the spot, and I decided I was willing to put myself on the spot, even in spite of the consequences that may result from it, because I know very well that if certain interests in the islands are so minded my chances of promotion could be stopped, and it would mean that I would have to return to the States to make my living. Now, gentlemen, this is a line of argument that it took a lot of nerve for me to make up my mind to come here and appear before you. I just came from a group of people where there were 15 or 20 present, and there was not a one in that group that was in favor of statehood, and at the same time there was not one of them besides myself who was willing to come here and say so. They were all island people, and they all knew what the island situation was, or is.

It seems to me, and I have been following this very closely, and I might say that I lived and taught in Oregon for 7 years, and I was born and raised in the Midwest; lived there until I was 21, and came to the west coast, and I graduated from the University of Oregon, and I am not saying this to appeal to Mr. Angell at all. I came to the islands, and I was at the Kamehameha Boys School, and I was there 1 year, and became dissatisfied, and I decided to go back to the

mainland, and in the meantime I met an island girl whom I fell in love with and I decided to stay in the islands and got a job as a teacher in the public schools.

My first experience in regard to the situation in the islands, which was entirely unfamiliar to me, was this: Before I came to the islands in 1940 I was told by some friends of mine to read the June issue of the 1940 Fortune magazine, and I have, and I would like to ask how many of your committee members have read that issue of the magazine—the June 1940, Fortune magazine?

Chairman LARCADE. Well, most of us read as much as we can, but we cannot read them all and still keep up with our work.

Mr. BARRETT. The reason for that is that Fortune magazine is recognized as quite an authentic magazine in its field, and I happen to be a teacher, and I am interested in how authentic my information is. I did not happen to have an opportunity to get hold of that magazine when it came out on the mainland. I still was interested because it was about Hawaii, and I asked the librarian at the boys school if that issue of Fortune was at hand in the school library, and I was told that one of the teachers had it out, and I tried for several months to get that copy, and found out several months later that the magazine was taken off the shelves at the Kamehameha Boys School, and I would be unable to get it. It presents a picture of the Hawaiian Islands which I think you gentlemen would be very much interested in reading.

In the 20's there was quite a move on for statehood in the islands, and at that time it was defeated by the big business interests of the islands. Now if statehood is a good thing for the islands why wasn't business in favor of it at that time, and why was it defeated? Well, this article, briefly, gives you this picture, how actually the Hawaiian Islands are of value for only one thing, but the people in the islands do not realize that; its value to the mainland is only for defense, and so the islands must serve that purpose. They don't think of the sugar or the pineapples that the Hawaiians grow, because as one of the gentlemen of the committee has said, the mainland grows plenty sugar, and could grow more, and the same with pineapple and all the rest of it, if we were not to raise it, so that the chief value of Hawaii to the mainland is for defense. One of the problems connected with defense, before 1940, was one of transportation. Since most of the foodstuffs on the islands were brought here in ships, if the islands still depended upon the mainland for shipping, then those ships, during the war, would have to be used to ship necessities for the islands—foodstuffs, and if the islands could raise their own foodstuffs these ships could be released to supply the Navy, and so looking at it from the Navy standards that was the third problem. Now what had to be done in order to raise foodstuffs on the islands? It would mean that many acres of sugar and pineapples would have to be given up, and the land used to raise foodstuffs, which the business interests of the islands were not willing to do. Therefore an argument to meet and to defeat the commission form of government was, it was realized, was the only thing possible in the case of the defense under that situation; that was statehood, and I am only referring to the article in Fortune magazine because it is based on the investigation that was held here.

Now it seems to me that on this question of bloc voting, and of the racial situation in the islands, is entirely a minor point as far as whether the islands are ready for statehood or not; and to me here in the Territory, it is like going back into the history of the United States, when the Territory is ready for statehood is a question, and the principal thing to consider is: Were those people so democratically minded that they understood what democracy meant, and were willing to exercise that democracy?

I am sorry to say, and again this is my own opinion, the group which I feel is the least democratically minded in the islands is the group that is of my own race. I am ashamed in a way to say it, but I feel it actually. I say that because it is the so-called haole group that controls the business interests of the islands. You gentlemen can find that if you are interested, and as that group is here; and yet that group actually disproves the very essence of democracy, which is "Live and let live." All I ask you to do is to look over the record. I frankly do not feel that they have lived up to that.

Going back to this issue of Fortune magazine, which I was told by a person who was in the publishing business—or in the newspaper business, as a friend, so I shall not mention his name—I was told that that issue of the Fortune magazine was taken off the newsstands of the Territory of Hawaii, and the only people in Hawaii who got it were those who were subscribers to it, and that was done because they did not wish it to be read. It brought up this point I mentioned about the problem of defense.

I should like to present another bit of evidence, which I am sorry I am not able to bring here. It is based on the Army and Navy report of the Pearl Harbor investigation. It came out in the September 1 issue of the United States News, in which—

Chairman LARCADE. What year?

Mr. BARRETT. Of 1945. Three men were sent over from the mainland, to conduct this Army investigation. One of the most interesting points in that investigation as it was quoted in this United States News was this, that came out in interviewing General Burgin, who was in charge of the antiaircraft artillery defenses on the island of Oahu, and of the coast artillery, and they asked him why it was that only 40 percent of his antiaircraft batteries had ever been in their permanent positions, and his reply was that he had not been able to get the leases from certain business interests which would enable him to put those antiaircraft batteries in place. Those were three men from Washington, and I am sorry I cannot give their names, but they asked him this question, in general: "Well, didn't those people realize that the defense of the United States was more important than their business at that particular time?" and the reply of General Burgin was something like this: "It would seem so, but at least that was not the case, because they were not able to negotiate the leases." The three gentlemen asked General Burgin who these men were, and General Burgin's answer was "Oh, my!" and then the three gentlemen said "Was Walter Dillingham one of those?" And "Was Mr. Walker one of those?" And General Burgin replied "Yes." Well, Walker was head of the HSPA at that time, and the reason the leases were not granted was that it meant giving up the sugar and pineapple lands for the installation of antiaircraft batteries. This is in the official

United States Navy report. I wondered at the time I read that if those men realized what real democracy is; when it comes to a type of democracy. In time of emergency which is the most important, your country or your business? To my mind, or to anyone who understands democracy, there could be but one answer given: "Their country."

On this point of bloc voting, Mr. Aona, to me, by his statement, was a good example of why he is elected. He has a personality, and he has the ability to make people like him,—O. K., Mr. Aona. I have been told this by several people of Japanese ancestry, that they would not wish a Japanese candidate to run for office for fear that he might be defeated, because if he were the whole group would lose face, as they say, and they would rather put someone in office who will favor that group and do the same job of representing them. It is not a case of bloc voting or of racial ancestry; it is a case of voting for the person who will devote his energy to the interests of that group regardless of what the ancestry is.

Chairman LARCADE. Isn't it a fact that there have been candidates for public office of the Japanese race who have been elected, and others who have been defeated, on this and on other islands in the Territory?

Mr. BARRETT. It certainly is. To me bloc voting is beside the point, and I have spent 4 years in Konawaena, and I can say they are about the finest group of any place I have seen.

One of the things that has come out in the investigations is the question of racial prejudice. That is something that those in the islands do not like to talk about. If they do they say that it is not here. Well, it is not here on the surface, but underneath it is general. In business you have a dual standard of wages. You have one standard of wages for your haoles or your whites and you have another standard for anyone who is nonhaole, with two men doing exactly the same work, the white man, or haole, gets one wage and the non-haole gets another wage, for doing exactly the same type of work.

Chairman LARCADE. Do you have any further statement to make?

Mr. BARRETT. That is all.

Chairman LARCADE. Mr. Farrington, would you like to interrogate the witness?

Delegate FARRINGTON. No.

Chairman LARCADE. Or any other member of the committee?

Representative ANGELL. You say you have had experience on the mainland as well as here in the islands. What is your view as to the character of the educational development of the youth here in this Territory as compared to the continental United States?

Mr. BARRETT. I would back up the statements of both Mrs. Richardson and Mr. Aona, if they would put certain exceptions in. In many ways—and right now I am not speaking as an authority, I am only speaking from my own experience—in many ways the school system of the Territory of Hawaii is the equal of that of any on the mainland, and in other ways I do not believe it is; and there is the further fact that in the schools which I have been in I have used books that were 2 years below the grade equivalents of those children, which shows that they are not up to the standards of English. Now let me explain that in detail, in case you do not understand what I am driving

at. I taught 11th grade American history for a year, and if I had used an average 11th grade history book with those boys and girls which I had in the class they would not be able to study that book and understand it, because of the vocabulary. I was forced to use a 9th grade book, so that they would be able to read it and understand it, and the same thing is true in most of the other subjects, which are being taught, and it is a known fact and the educational department makes no bones about it, and it is due to the language problem in the islands. It does not mean that it is always going to continue.

Representative ANGELL. How about the I. Q. of the students here?

Mr. BARRETT. Well—

Representative ANGELL. That is, as compared with those on the mainland?

Mr. BARRETT. As an educator, an I. Q. is not a basis for sound judgment of a person's ability. It is the adjustment which that person has. Several years ago the I. Q. was considered very authentic, but at the present time it is not so considered.

Representative ANGELL. Well, to use a different expression, what is the general level of intelligence down here?

Mr. BARRETT. Intelligence is not based on race or color. You have just as smart people in the Negro and the Filipino and the Japanese and Chinese races, as you have in any other race, and my experience is and has been that we have had some very smart boys and girls, as shown by an American history test, where a boy of Japanese ancestry—and I am proud to say this—rated as high as a sophomore in college, in his ability and on what he knew, and yet he was only a junior in high school.

Representative ANGELL. The objections to statehood based on racial origin could be handled under statehood just as successfully as under a Territorial form of government could they not?

Mr. BARRETT. Let me point out still further, if certain groups in the islands would practice democracy I would be in favor of statehood, but I actually believe this, it may not be true, but it is still what I believe, that I believe as an American citizen I have a right to present my views without fear or favor, and the only proof of democracy to me will be whether or not I receive any criticism because of my appearance here.

Under a Territorial form of government the business interests are not able to control the courts, because the judges are appointed by the President of the United States and confirmed by the Senate, and neither are they able to control the appointment of the Governor, and there has been severe criticism of our Governor because of his independence, and they would like to get rid of him. Under statehood both the courts and the Government would be in the control of the people in the islands, and the group then which controls the business of the islands controls the votes, which is not only true here but is true anywhere.

Representative ANGELL. Do you believe that the group to which you have referred should be permitted to prevent statehood if the people are entitled to statehood and are qualified to become a State, the same as any other State in the Union?

Mr. BARRETT. I am not just sure I get your question clearly, Mr. Angell.

Representative ANGELL. Well, if the people here are qualified for statehood, certainly under our form of government they ought to have statehood. Do you think that any group should be permitted to stand in the way of their getting statehood?

Mr. BARRETT. Well, the question in my mind is, Will democracy be better practiced under the present situation or be better under statehood? At the present time I firmly believe that our best practice of democracy can be done under a Territory.

Representative ANGELL. Under the Territorial form of government the people are not up to a full stature of citizenship; they are really in tutelage; they don't have an opportunity to participate as other States in the Union do in the affairs of government, and do not have an opportunity to elect their own representatives; and they do not have a voice on taxation, and they are in the position of having no representation, though taxed, and there should be no taxation without representation. Your people here pay a pretty heavy tax, and they have no voice in it.

Mr. BARRETT. I am glad you asked that. That came out in another investigation which I think you men held, and there was a reference to the rule of the English king, I believe, and stating that it was very much like the rule over the Colonies, in which it was said they were being taxed without being represented. For many years the folks in America thought that, and then they found out they were wrong, because it was a question of what kind of representation you are talking about. In England the Colonies were represented, because Benjamin Franklin was a representative over there, and there was developing in America the idea of local representative; that is, that a man must live in the district from which he was elected in order to represent that district, and England said Benjamin Franklin represents the Thirteen Colonies, and Georgia said "No, he doesn't represent us because he lives in Pennsylvania," which was a difference in the idea of representation. That is one of the things we have here in the islands, and this is going to hit very close to home, but I don't want anyone to feel I am speaking about this in a personal sense at all, but as it is now run we in the islands do not have the viewpoint of local representation. It is possible for a man to be elected from a district in which he does not live and make his living.

Representative ANGELL. That is true in England.

Mr. BARRETT. Then we have here in the islands an English type of representation. We are represented by Mr. Farrington, for all of the islands, and we do not have a vote.

Chairman LARCADE. Referring to your reference to Benjamin Franklin, he was not much more than an observer; he had no voice in the passage of the laws which applies to the American Colonies.

Mr. BARRETT. True enough.

Chairman LARCADE. He could represent, through the officials of England, our views, but they need not follow him if they did not care to.

Mr. BARRETT. I heard some talk about changing the present legislative act which does allow that.

Here is another situation which to me doesn't tend towards democracy. The Territorial law reads that after 1 year of residence in the islands a person is a citizen of the Territory of Hawaii, with

all the rights of citizenship, one of which should be holding public office, but he has to live here 3 years before he can hold government positions here.

Chairman LARCADE. That is true in many States, too; that qualification applies, before you can hold public office or be a candidate for public office; that is true in various states.

Mr. BARRETT. True enough, but as applying to teachers in the public schools of Hawaii, do you think that is one of the things that should be necessary?

Chairman LARCADE. I am not answering questions; I am asking them.

Representative MILLER. I am sure the gentleman is very sincere; I am satisfied of that, but I don't want to get into a controversy with him on American history, but there are several things that he has overlooked, some of which may be corrected if Hawaii is granted statehood. In the first place, Hawaii would have to have a constitutional convention to draw up a constitution, and then into that constitution the people would put those things, within the structure of the Federal Constitution, that they desired, and that is a form of local government.

In California, for instance, the qualification for citizenship, for voting purposes, is 1 year's residence, but you cannot qualify for relief under 3 years. In California you are not required to live within the district you represent, to represent California in the Congress of the United States. And such a thing is happening over there right at the present time, where Helen Douglas, who comes from southern California, lives in one district but represents another district in which she is not a resident. Now that has happened on several occasions, but to hold office in our legislature you must reside in the specific district.

I would like to know who wrote the article in Fortune to which you refer. Do you remember?

Mr. BARRETT. I am sorry, I cannot tell you. I would rather not say, unless I can be exact.

Representative MILLER. I would say this, with all due respect to one of our colleagues who has had some connection with Fortune magazine, I do not take it as a Bible or as the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. BARRETT. I don't either.

Representative MILLER. Have you given thought to this? You have raised the question that there are dual standards of wages in the Territory. Well, we at one time had a dual standard of wages in California, but the unions took care of that, and in pretty good shape, and if the people of this country are union-minded I am certain they can take care of it so far as that goes.

So far as bloc voting is concerned, maybe I am a good example of that. I don't belong to a labor union, yet labor vigorously supports me. Maybe I lean over backward in trying to do a good job and better than perhaps one of their own members would do, but I am very much devoted to the cause, and I think some of the objections you raise, while there may be some basis to them, I don't think, as far as I am concerned, many of them are too pertinent. I think you can wipe out some of these things. I think the people can rise to stop them. They have to accept responsibility somehow. If you will read

the history of any State, and read it critically, I think you will see that they had to go through certain of these periods, and I want to say this in regard to your appearance here, and I would like to say it for the record, Mr. Chairman, that if I thought that punitive action would be taken against you for exercising your right, under democracy, of expressing yourself here, as far as you have, and it could be proven that that was the reason you were discharged and discriminated against, I know as far as my own vote would go, on this committee, it would make a tremendous difference, and I would like to put that into the record. If I thought for a minute that you were going to be discriminated against for doing your American duty, then I would say Hawaii is not fitted for statehood.

Mr. BARRETT. Thank you, sir, very much; that makes me feel a great deal better.

Delegate FARRINGTON. I would like to have the witness answer a few questions to further clarify his point of view.

Do you feel on the basis of your experience as a private and public school teacher that the Hawaiian-born children can be entrusted with the responsibilities of American citizenship?

Mr. BARRETT. Yes, I do, Mr. Farrington, very much.

Delegate FARRINGTON. In other words, do you feel that they are up to the same standards, on the average, as in the States, and therefore are capable of carrying the responsibilities of American citizenship?

Mr. BARRETT. I feel that they are capable, but I won't say that they have had the opportunities for an education that the mainland offers.

Delegate FARRINGTON. In other words, your approach to this question is—or your point of view, or the determining factor in your point of view, is not any consideration of race, is it?

Mr. BARRETT. No, sir; it is not.

Delegate FARRINGTON. And you feel that by reason of the environment in which the people here live, and the public school system, that people of very diverse origin are being raised and educated to a high standard of American citizenship?

Mr. BARRETT. I definitely do.

Delegate FARRINGTON. You said you believe in democracy?

Mr. BARRETT. I do.

Delegate FARRINGTON. You would not have the people of this island or this Territory disenfranchised?

Mr. BARRETT. No, I would not.

Delegate FARRINGTON. You feel, in addition, that they should be secure in their rights as American citizens and of franchise?

Mr. BARRETT. Of course; I could not believe anything else.

Delegate FARRINGTON. And if you believe so strongly, as you say, in democracy, you must feel that they should be entrusted ultimately with the full measure of local self-government, as are people in other American communities?

Mr. BARRETT. I think I see ahead just what you are drawing up to; your idea.

Delegate FARRINGTON. I am merely trying to clarify your point of view, and not to combat it, whatever it is, because it is very important for the record that that be done.

You do not come in here as some opponents of statehood have come in here, to challenge the record of our people as citizens?

Mr. BARRETT. No, I do not; only a particular group.

Delegate FARRINGTON. Then on the question of that particular group, if my recollection is correct, the article in *Fortune* to which you refer relates to the economic structure of the Territory?

Mr. BARRETT. It does, sir.

Delegate FARRINGTON. And more particularly to the sugar industry?

Mr. BARRETT. And pineapple.

Delegate FARRINGTON. And it develops the thesis that we have a highly integrated economy, that is extremely monopolistic?

Mr. BARRETT. Yes.

Delegate FARRINGTON. And your feeling is, and you are convinced, on the basis of your experience, that such is a fact, and it is because of that, that you would oppose statehood at this time?

Mr. BARRETT. I am glad you said "at this time," because I do not oppose statehood if such a hold on the Territory can be broken, and I am glad you mentioned "labor," Mr. Miller, because I think that is who can break it.

Delegate FARRINGTON. You feel that that situation has prevailed for a long period of time, do you not?

Mr. BARRETT. Yes; since the time that the missionaries left the missionary business to go into the other fields.

Delegate FARRINGTON. This condition has prevailed, has it not, under the Territorial form of government, where the Federal Government controls everybody in the executive and judicial branches of government?

Mr. BARRETT. That's true.

Delegate FARRINGTON. And has the right to repeal any law of the Territory?

Mr. BARRETT. That's true.

Delegate FARRINGTON. And is it your opinion that perpetuating that system for another 5, or 10, or 15 years is going to improve that situation?

Mr. BARRETT. It won't help it under statehood, and at the present time that group can only control the legislature, whereas under statehood they could go ahead and run the Governor, but under the status of a Territory they cannot.

Delegate FARRINGTON. I am glad to have you express your views, but whatever the case may be the fact remains that they are in this position there today and they have been in this position under the Territorial form of government, and if you believe in democracy, and if you believe that the people of this Territory have qualified themselves for the privileges of American citizenship, isn't it possible that if they are entrusted with this additional responsibility they will find some means of correcting this particular difficulty?

Mr. BARRETT. It is possible, but I am also taking into consideration the control which there is in the islands. It is possible; but will it happen? There is a question there. I don't know.

Delegate FARRINGTON. I wanted to clarify your point of view on that, and may I ask you, for the record, if you are acquainted with Mr. Jack Hall of the CIO?

Mr. BARRETT. I am, sir.

Delegate FARRINGTON. And if you believe that they are under the influence of the economic, industrial leaders of the Territory?

Mr. BARRETT. No; I do not.

Delegate FARRINGTON. And did you read his testimony before the committee last week?

Mr. BARRETT. Indeed I did.

Delegate FARRINGTON. In which he declared himself strongly for statehood?

Mr. BARRETT. Yes; I might say that because I say something doesn't absolutely make it so. I am only presenting my opinion. Now democracy represents a group, some of which believe this and some which believe that, and on the basis of which, on the basis of what the majority desire, is what is done, but I do not feel that this would have been a fair presentation to have only heard one side, is what I mean.

Chairman LARCADE. I might say in that regard, we have heard many sides of the question, in Honolulu, and many have represented both points of view.

Mr. BARRETT. I may be wrong, but that is what I think.

Chairman LARCADE. I feel that your testimony in support of the people of Hawaii, and with the background of public school teaching, that you have, is about as strong testimony as anybody could want in support of statehood. For that portion of your testimony, I thank you.

Representative MILLER. I would like to say if I may, Mr. Chairman, that as far as I am concerned, having given some little study to the thing, I think you will agree with me, sir, that the people of this Territory have made greater progress in the field of education, and in a limited time, than some of us on the mainland have made who have been at it for 100 years. Given the same length of time, another generation, will most likely bring these people up to the standards of the mainland in all respects, and we might have to go out and do a little merging ourselves to keep ahead of them in the future.

Mr. BARRETT. To me that is not the issue.

Representative MILLER. It is not the issue so far as statehood is concerned, but it is the issue in that you cannot have democracy and ignorance; they don't go together. Democracy is built on intelligence and on education. You probably remember Mr. Jefferson's speeches, that you have to have universal education to make democracy work, and the higher and more universal our form of education is, the better democracy we are going to get; they go hand in hand, and that is your responsibility as a teacher, and of all teachers—I am not speaking just of you.

Mr. BARRETT. I haven't anything more to say.

(Mr. Barrett is excused as a witness.)

Chairman LARCADE. Is there anyone present that would like to testify briefly. If so we would be glad to hear from them.

In the event that there are no citizens present who desire to speak on statehood, I wish to state the committee will be in Honolulu through next Friday, and the committee will hold hearings there at the Palace, and if anyone desires to file a brief or make a statement on the questions under discussion at this time, you may do so; beginning Tuesday and through Thursday.

ABNER T. LONGLEY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, my name is Abner T. Longley, and I am plantation manager for the Hawaiian Pineapple

Co. on Oahu. I was formerly Democratic national committeeman for Hawaii, and the chairman of the central committee, and at the present time I am chairman of the statehood committee for the Democratic Party, and the reason I appear here is because I am here on a vacation and missed you in Honolulu.

I want to say right off the bat that I am in favor of statehood, but I think there are one or two corrections in our set-up here that should be gone into before we get it. Incidentally, I was a member of the statehood committee in 1940.

Now I want to say something about this reapportionment business. You have heard my friend, Mr. Aona, say that they get more than their share over here. That is partly because they have 4 representatives from this district, that represent about 1,000 people each, and on Oahu in the fourth district there are 6 representatives, each representing 4,000 people each, and that is true in the fifth district on Oahu, where they have representatives representing about 3,200 people each; that was in 1940. And throughout the Territory you have 60 percent of the representation on the outside islands, and with about from 35 to 40 percent of the voting population.

Now the Organic Act requires the legislature here to reapportion the Territory every 10 years. Since the annexation they have had—it is 35 years from the first time it should have been done, and it has never been done. First one wants to reapportion the senate, and then the house, and they have never agreed to reapportion them both as required by the Organic Act.

I feel very definitely that before an enabling act is passed that the legislature here should be required to comply with the Organic Act and reapportion this Territory.

There is one other thing that I would like to call to your attention, and that is the fact that we do not have political parties here in this Territory as you know them in the States. We have no closed primary; every Tom, Dick and Harry who can go out and vote, will vote for everybody or anybody in the primary and go back and vote for them or somebody else in the general election. I feel that the Territory should be required to pass laws requiring a closed primary, so that you can make your candidates responsible to somebody. When they get in there, when they get in the legislature, you have about 45 different political parties, when they are elected. It is all right when they are running for office, when they want to have the support of the party, and some go around and collect the votes and put on a program, but once they get in there they say "I was elected by Tom, Dick and Harry," and he isn't a Democrat or a Republican, and this applies to both parties, as far as I can see, and I have been mixed up in this thing for a long time.

I therefore feel that before an enabling act is passed that our Legislature should be told to pass laws which would change both those situations.

That is all I have to say.

Chairman LARCADE. Are there any observations on this statement?
(No response.)

Chairman LARCADE. Mr. Farrington.

Delegate FARRINGTON. I would like to ask the witness: As far as reappointment is concerned, this is the point of view of the people on Oahu, in which you live, where you are a resident?

Mr. LONGLEY. That is correct, but it should reflect the point of view of the people of the Territory as a whole, no matter what island the people live on; I think they should be represented equally in the legislature.

Representative ANGELL. That same situation exists in my own State, and in my particular district. It has over a third of the population and more than a third of the wealth, and much less, 15 or 20 percent, of representation. It has out of 60 members of the legislature only 13, with a third of the population it should have over 20, and that is true in a good many States of the Union.

Mr. LONGLEY. I realize that.

Representative ANGELL. In heavily populated areas, if they had full representation according to number, it would be very top-heavy, and they would control in a good many legislatures.

Representative MILLER. In California, and we are very close to California here, so I am using it as an example, we have our lower house or assembly on a strict apportionment, on a population basis, and the upper house, as it is called, is apportioned on a geographical basis, so in the senate you have one senator who represents two counties, Inyo and Mono, with about 3,500 population, and you have one senator who represents Los Angeles County, the biggest district represented by any one man, legislative district, I suppose, in the world, with over three and a half million, but you get along very well, and it would be my thought as a good Democrat, to you, to say that when you draw your State constitution then is the time to do it; Congress cannot do it, or cannot force it—to write into that constitution a form of representation such as, or much as California has, which is a good one, or something of that nature, and I would also suggest that you write into it an initiative and referendum and recall, and you will very soon get some response through your public officials.

Mr. LONGLEY. Well, in reply to that I would like to say that that is in compliance with your State constitution.

Representative MILLER. That's right.

Mr. LONGLEY. Well, what we have here is not in compliance.

Representative MILLER. No; but before you become a State it can be attended to. You don't just become a State by adopting the Organic Act. You will have to hold an election and submit a constitution to the Federal Government for confirmation, and then it is up to the alert people of these islands under a democratic form of government to see that the proper type of constitution is adopted. You most likely will borrow the best in the constitutions of the several States. I can tell you several things from California that you might well include.

Mr. LONGLEY. Yes; and we probably will follow it very closely. However, if that is left to our legislature I am sure that as long as it is not on a popular vote basis it will get through, but if it is not on a popular vote basis why it will never get through, and that is what I am interested in.

Representative MILLER. You want to get equal representation. I think that Congress has always required it in the case of States. I don't know whether it is the law, but they have always required a constitutional convention as a basis for it, and you will have to write that constitution, so that you will have to elect new people to it, but I would ask the legislature to give them sufficient money to do the job, because we still owe some \$75,000 on our constitution which we have never paid for.

Chairman LARCADE. I think that is a matter you can take care of if the Territory is admitted as a State, and has a constitution.

Thank you, Mr. Longley.

(Mr. Longley excused as a witness.)

Chairman LARCADE. The committee will invite any citizen who has any statement to make to present the same to our committee before it completes its hearing in Honolulu, beginning next Tuesday.

We thank you very much for the opportunity of holding this hearing here.

(Meeting adjourned at 6:05 p. m., Sunday, January 13, 1946.)

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII

MONDAY, JANUARY 14, 1946

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE TERRITORIES,
Volcano House, Hawaii National Park, Hawaii, T. H.

Following statement ordered filed, by Chairman Larcade, at 2:35 p. m., Monday January 14, 1946, as part of transcript of proceedings of subcommittee's meetings:

GENERAL STATEMENT ON HAWAII NATIONAL PARK FOR THE INFORMATION OF SUBCOMMITTEE OF COMMITTEE ON TERRITORIES, UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, PRESENTED BY ERNEST G. WINGATE, SUPERINTENDENT

GENERAL

Hawaii National Park was established by act of Congress August 1, 1916, and was placed under the control of the National Park Service of the Department of the Interior, for the purpose of preserving unimpaired and in a natural state the region surrounding and including the most spectacular areas of volcanic interest in the United States. It was "perpetually dedicated and set apart * * * for the benefit and enjoyment of the people of the United States."

The park is composed of two separate tracts of land on the islands of Hawaii and Maui. The tract on Hawaii is known as the Kilauea-Mauna Loa section and is much the larger. It extends from sea level to the 13,680 foot summit of Mauna Loa volcano. That on Maui is known as the Haleakala section and contains the great scenic crater of Haleakala. Kilauea and Mauna Loa are active volcanoes, Haleakala is dormant.

The volcanoes that, through the ages, built the Hawaiian Islands are the features of greatest interest, yet they cannot be separated in interest (except for scientific study) from the forests and wildlife that have evolved on their slopes and the Hawaiians who long ago settled these islands. Each of these features is but a part of the inspiring story—the creation and evolution of life in the Pacific islands—that this park was set aside to tell.

THE VOLCANOES

Kilauea, elevation 4,090 feet, where the park headquarters is located, is a caldera formed by collapse of the mountain dome. Its recorded history dates from 1823 and from that time it was variously and almost continuously active until 1924 when a subterranean drainage of molten lava occurred, followed by a series of great steam blast eruptions, that enlarged its inner crater (Halemau-mau) to its present size. Short lived, but spectacular, eruptions of molten lava have occurred in the inner crater eight times since 1924. The last was in 1934. Lava from Kilauea flowed underground to the southeast in 1938 and the volcano showed signs of uneasiness in 1944 and 1945.

Mauna Loa, which is one of the largest single mountain masses in the world, erupts on an average, every 3½ years, either producing flank flows or by flowing or cone building in its summit caldera, Mokuaweweo. In the past 120 years four lava flows reached the sea and four others stopped only a short distance from the shore. These flows, spectacular and harmless on the barren upper mountain slopes, completely destroy everything in their path when they reach the forested and agricultural land. The flow of 1880-81 nearly destroyed the city of Hilo and that of 1926 obliterated the little Hawaiian village of Hoopuloa. Mauna Loa sent a sizeable flow toward Hilo in 1935 and a lesser one in 1942, which was the latest activity on that mountain. It was seen smoking in considerable volume a number of times in 1945 and for a few days early this month. Activity in the

summit crater or a flank flow, probably on the eastern or Hilo side, is expected in the near future.

Started as a private institution, financed by businessmen of the Territory, the Hawaiian Volcano Observatory, now operated by the Government as one of the divisions of the park, has continuously observed and recorded the activities of the volcanoes since 1912. Cooperating in this important work are the University of Hawaii and the Volcano Research Association.

THE FORESTS

Because of climatic and volcanic conditions only about one-fifth of the park area has any forest cover and about one-third of that is scattering. Because of its small extent, protection of the park's forest is of greatest importance. The forest is wholly native to the Hawaiian Islands and much of it is peculiar to them with many rare species. The preservation of the native forest is a necessity in the preservation of the unique native birds that depend upon the native forests for their food. Prior to the coming of white men to the islands the forests and birds had evolved undisturbed through long ages and a state of balance in nature had been achieved. This balance in the last 100 years was upset by the advancement of our civilization, with the result that many species of plants and birds have become extinct and numerous others are seriously endangered. Uncontrolled browsing by goats, sheep, and cattle in the early days of Hawaii has resulted in the partial and complete destruction of many thousands of acres of good land, much of it in valuable watersheds.

The park is giving its most serious attention to forest preservation and protection of the remaining native birds because of the inspirational, scientific, and economic values involved. These values will be increasingly threatened in the islands by postwar developments, and larger forested areas than the small section within the park should be given the same complete protection offered by the park, either by addition to it or by the establishment of similar preserves through action of the Territorial legislature. Completion by the Territorial government of the land acquisition in Kalapana addition to the park, authorized by Congress in June 1938, will increase the forested area in the park by about two-thirds and will be an important step in forest and birdlife conservation.

THE WILDLIFE

Many kinds of birds gained a foothold in the islands and from their distant ancestors have evolved a unique bird life. Native mammals, with the exception of the Hawaiian bat and rat, are absent, though the wild pig when descended from stock brought by the early Hawaiians is classed as native. Reptiles are represented in the park only by a few small lizards and along the shore the green turtle. The shore line abounds in colorful and edible fishes and shellfish.

Because of the scarcity of other wildlife the bird life has assumed greater importance, but because of its unique quality its preservation would always be of great concern. For the past 10 years qualified employees of the park have been engaged in original research into the problem of the declining bird life with a view toward finding means to preserve the remaining species. The results so far as respects the forest birds are encouraging. Migratory and shore-line birds and those ranging wide in the islands are more endangered.

These studies have indicated that preservation of the bird life depends primarily upon perpetuation of the native Hawaiian forests. Forests now within the park are probably too small for this purpose should the surrounding forests continue to be disturbed. Some park boundary changes to include contiguous wilderness forests or establishment of wildlife refuges by Territorial or Federal action is indicated.

Of the Hawaiian birds the wide-ranging dry-land goose (Nene), now on the verge of extinction in a wild state, is the most appealing to the majority of people because of its size, beauty, curious behavior traits, and excellent eating qualities. It is estimated that there are now only 50 of these birds in a wild state. Its range includes much park land but its breeding sites are almost wholly outside on private or Government-owned land, hence there is no assurance of preserving it except in captivity.

ARCHAEOLOGY, HISTORY, AND PRESENT-DAY HAWAIIANS

While the interior of the crater of Haleakala is by far the most important area known in the park archaeologically, the Kilauea section and particularly

the region included in the Kalapana addition to the park has many artifacts and is suspected of offering considerable opportunity for research. In the fires of Kilauea was the home of the Hawaiian Goddess Pele. Her priests had their temple not far from where the Volcano House now stands. At Kilauea Princess Kapiolani defied the taboos of Pele and hastened the advancement of Christianity in the islands. To the southwest of Kilauea in the hardened ash of the explosive eruption of 1790 are the footprints of the soldiers of Keaoua who were then engaged in the long warfare that preceded the uniting of the islands under the rule of Kamahameha. The coastal region of the park was formerly inhabited by the Hawaiians as was that in the authorized Kalapana addition. In the inland cliffs were their burial caves. Several of their village sites remain and there are extensive areas of rock carvings, so far undeciphered. There are two large heiaus, or temples, in a fair state of preservation in the Kalapana addition.

The Hawaiians came to these islands probably more than a thousand years ago. In that time, people of nature as they were and are, their lives became interwoven with all the natural features of the islands until they became a part of and essential to the understanding and appreciation of the volcanoes, the forests, the birds, and the fishes. The Kalapana addition to the park (act of Congress June 20, 1938) properly recognizes this fact and has authorized the Secretary of the Interior to open homesites in the area to Hawaiians of at least one-half pure blood. By this there was restored to their use an area which they had years ago extensively inhabited. Considerable idle private land has yet to be acquired before the addition is completed but the Territorial government is proceeding with a condemnation suit for about one-fourth of this land.

Statistical data

Area of park.....	acres.....	173, 399
Area of Kilauea-Mauna Loa section.....	do.....	156, 269
Area Haleakala section.....	do.....	17, 130
Forest lands area:		
Kilauea-Mauna Loa section (heavy forest and jungle, 19,000 acres).....	acres.....	33, 400
Haleakala section largely shrubs.....	do.....	1, 200
Grass land and shrubs Kilauea-Mauna Loa section.....	do.....	13, 000
Waste land, lava flows, and volcanic ash:		
Kilauea-Mauna Loa section.....	do.....	110, 269
Haleakala section.....	do.....	15, 930
Total private land acquired for the park.....	do.....	38, 054
Total land withdrawn from public domain.....	do.....	135, 345
Number miles of road in park.....		63. 8
Paved.....		41. 4
Unpaved.....		22. 4
Government investment in roads.....		\$1, 650, 000
Number of Government-owned buildings.....		98
Value of Government-owned buildings.....		\$450, 000
Number of miles trails, foot or horse.....		187
Number of visitors:		
1941.....		324, 728
1944.....		397, 099
1945.....		381, 059
Total number regular full-time employees:		
1941.....		28
1946.....		16
Regular appropriation:		
1941.....		\$62, 000
1946.....		\$47, 500
Estimate (this includes \$37,660 for replacement of worn-out equipment and purchase of some new equipment and provides for the same staff as was on duty in 1941 at present wage levels) 1947.....		\$118, 933
Land area of inhabited islands.....	acres.....	4, 119, 400
Percentage of park land to islands area.....		4. 2

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII

MONDAY, JANUARY 14, 1946

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE TERRITORIES,
*En route by automobile from the Volcano House,
Hawaii National Park, Hawaii, T. H.*

Present: Representative Henry D. Larcade, Louisiana, chairman; Hon. Eugene Capellas, president of the senate, Territorial legislature, and a resident of the island of Hawaii.

Chairman LARCADE. Senator Capellas, do you wish to make a statement at this time to be taken as part of the meeting which is about to take place at Hilo, in order to save the time of the committee, as our time is limited, rather than having me examine you there, unless you desire to appear and testify there?

Mr. CAPELLAS. I will make my statement right now, if it will save time.

Chairman LARCADE. Very well. You may make your statement now, covering the matter of the recreational center used by the services that is located here within the Kilauea area of the Hawaii National Park, and, secondly, your position on statehood; anything you wish to present. First please state your name, your occupation, and what position you occupy in the Territory.

Mr. CAPELLAS. My name is Eugene Capellas, and I live on this island of Hawaii. I was elected a new member of the Territorial senate, and on the morning of the opening of the legislature my colleagues practically forced me to take the presidency of the senate. I took it under protest because being new, a new member of that body, I thought that one of the older members should have taken it, but they said that they felt that with my background in the educational field and my sound, understanding knowledge of Territorial affairs, that I would make a good president, and I want to say that though I made a few mistakes, and of course I am human like the rest of us, I did a fair job of handling that senate during the 1945 session.

Chairman LARCADE. Did you hold any other political office during your career?

Mr. CAPELLAS. Well, I was the chairman of the Republican Party for 10 years, and every time we had a meeting they would elect me chairman. They said, "You are all right. You stay right there." So I could not get out of it, because I have been a Republican from the first election, after we became a Territory, up to date. I have been a Republican but I have always felt that any person elected to public office should forget about affiliations when handling the business of the people, and when I took the office of president of the senate, in my acceptance speech I requested of my fellow senators that during the

session all political affiliations be set aside, and of course we were at war, and we were there to attend to the people's business, and we should forget all partisan affiliations and vote for the best interests of the people, and we did so.

I appeared before the congressional committee in 1935, in Hilo here. They picked out a few of us and said "We want you down here to appear before the congressional committee, to give testimony," and I said O. K., and I sat down and wrote out my statement and read it before the congressional committee, and that is on record.

Then in 1937 they telephoned to me from Honolulu and requested that I come down there and appear before the congressional committee to make a statement for statehood, because I have always believed that we deserved statehood.

I was in the teaching profession a long time—for 47 years—and in my curriculum in the schools, as I said to you earlier, health came first, and character training came next, and the third was academic training. I feel that I have really done my duty by my country and my profession by training our youth to be loyal American citizens.

When I appeared before those two congressional committees I told them I sincerely felt that the time had come when the youth of Hawaii, consisting of various racial groups, who came here to better themselves in their social and economic life, I believed had been brought into one homogeneous group; that is, a group any community could be proud of, and I felt that our boys and our girls would be as loyal to the United States as the sons of President Roosevelt, and that is on record, as I stated before.

It is gratifying to me that this war proved my contention, that the youth of Hawaii, our boys in Hawaii, would be loyal to the Stars and Stripes, irrespective of race, color, or creed. Our boys at the front have proved themselves to be among the best soldiers in Uncle Sam's Army. Why? Because our educational system here was such that loyalty and the teaching of Americanization and patriotism were fundamental in our educational system. Hawaii has one of the best educational systems to be found in the Nation. New York ranks highest, I know that, and we all know that, and California has a very good educational system, but we don't take our hats off to any of them. We look them straight in the eye and say, "We are as good as you are." I am saying this emphatically because I was in the educational service so long; I grew up with the services, for I was 17 years and a half in age when I started to teach. Back in those days there was no University of Hawaii, no university at all, no high schools here, but there was one high school in Honolulu. I had private teachers, and I had to study like nobody's business to attain an education. So I am self-made. I was considered one of the outstanding principals of schools, and we had a junior college, called an intermediate school, here, and we carried our students up to the tenth grade, and they went to high school in Hilo for the junior and senior years. The students in the intermediate school were outstanding, and we carried 20 to 25 percent of the honor roll in the Hilo High School, in an enrollment of 1,500 to 1,700, and we had only about 100 in the school there, from the graduates from my school. In June 1944 the Hilo High School graduated 325 students, and my old school, the Hakalau School, had about 45 students in that group, and out of 520, and the president of the student

body was a graduate of the Hakalau School, and the president of the group of the Smith-Hughes farm group was one of my boys, because we had been 100 percent for agricultural education.

Our Territory is one where we must consider the agriculture subject very seriously, and agriculture is the backbone of our country, and I have always been favorable and partial, maybe, toward educational work in the way of vocational work. We cannot all be white-collared gentlemen, and we must have men who will produce with their hands, and I have always said that I hold 100 percent for it.

You have heard about the Big Five here locally. I want to say this: The Big Five is responsible for the Territory as it stands today. The Big Five consists of men who have developed our agricultural industry to a degree that the sugar man of Hawaii is recognized throughout the world as being the most scientific and as having developed the sugarcane industry to a high degree, the most scientific in the world; in the whole world. Scientists and sugar men from all over the world where sugarcane is grown come to Hawaii to make a study of our scientific methods, because we have the best there is.

This Territory, when it started out, was a kingdom. Whalers were the only ships that came here, and industry was nil; there was just a little traffic with the whalers, when they came down here. Later sugar men began to develop the sugar industry, and they had to have ships come here, because they needed mills, they needed mules, they needed plows, and they needed hoes and other things that belonged to the sugar industry, and they had to import them, and those same ships had to export, to take away our sugar, and little by little the sugar industry developed, and other industries subordinate to the sugar industry have also developed, so that what the Territory is today is due to the efforts of this so-called Big Five.

Any good American will admit that the Big Five is entitled to consideration, because it is their money that is invested in our different industries which go to make this Territory what it is. So that economically the Big Five deserves plenty of consideration, and they do hold plenty of power, and they are entitled to it.

Chairman LARCADE. At this point may I ask if you know of any instances where people who have opposed the Big Five in any way have been intimidated or where there has been any retaliation on the part of the Big Five, or the so-called Big Five?

Mr. CAPELLAS. To be honest, I will say that 20 years ago, or more than that, there was some discrimination, but it has been on a minor scale, and the Big Five has always been generous, too, in many ways. All capital is selfish in a way, whether it is here or on the mainland, but I want to repeat myself there and say that the Big Five or any of the capitalists are entitled to consideration, and they do hold some power economically, but politically the Big Five does not hold more than 25 percent of the power that they held 20 years or more ago.

Now in this Territory you will find that the younger element, the new generation, is very much like people in that same generation on the mainland, and I think on the mainland today their condition is very, very different from what their parents or their grandparents had to contend with. This newer generation is more independent, and they do more for themselves, and they do things in a different way, but fundamentally they are the same American boys that their fore-

fathers were, and there is no difference as I can see, and I have lived with them a good many years.

Chairman LARCADE. Now would you care, Senator, to make any observation with respect to the question of bloc voting in the Territory?

Mr. CAPELLAS. Yes. You hear various charges about bloc-voting. I do not care where you go, there will be the very same sort of bloc-voting, and by that I mean that a candidate who is very popular in his community or in his district, his friends will go around and say "We are going to vote for so and so because we want him elected; he is our man, and we will vote for him as against some new candidates whom we do not have as much confidence in," and so to insure the election of their man they say "We are going to vote for him," and we call it bloc-voting here, and it really is bloc-voting, and you find that also on the mainland, just the same thing, and it is not only in Hawaii that such a thing goes on, but if you mean by bloc-voting a racial group, voting for candidates of the same race, I do not look at it that way, and that is the point I am trying to bring out, and while no people are "pure white," I do not know of that kind of bloc-voting, and to me it does not come into this picture, and when I ran for Senator there were four Republican candidates and I led the ticket, and I was a new man, and the other three were old campaigners, all of different racial groups, and the people knew of me as a school man, who had endeavored to be democratic, and who tried to teach our youth to be loyal Americans. I have preached Americanism and patriotism and the making of good citizens for years and years and years, and tried to teach them the principles of a true democracy, and although I am one of the principals who partially developed the Territorial school curriculum—I developed a curriculum of my own, which I felt was a better one, based on the three R's—and I am also strong for progressive education, but I think it goes too far, and I do not believe in a theoretical progressive education because it tends to send the children up into the clouds and they do not come down, and I think the best course to pursue is to have a good sound education which has its roots in our Hawaiian way of life, so to speak, and to have a curriculum that will be every bit as good as those on the mainland, and afford every opportunity to the children of this Territory.

Chairman LARCADE. In order for the record to be complete, I think it would be well to give us a short biography of your life and something about your background.

Mr. CAPELLAS. I was born at sea, and landed here, not as an American at that time, but as a citizen of Hawaii, and I understand that flagship under which you sailed is the nationality under which you are born, and that is the way the law reads. I was educated in the public schools of Hawaii and I am a product of our public schools, and as I told you, I am a self-made man, and I have studied a lot; I studied law through correspondence, and I taught school, and I took a course in the university here in the afternoons, and in the normal school, and so on, and I have built myself up to what I am today. I know I have had contacts which have helped me materially. I have traveled on the mainland of the United States twice, and I have traveled through the Orient twice, and traveling is one of the best ways to acquire an education, because you see things and you make your own observations and conclusions, and you meet people, and I feel that although I did

not attend a university I have done well by myself, and as to my family, I have a wonderful family; five of my children are school teachers, and my wife and I were school teachers, so that is saying something. I have spent all the money I have ever earned in educating my children. So today I have no money, but we don't want any money, either; money is only good to buy food and clothing, and I have that, and that is all I want.

Chairman LARCADE. You have lived here all of your life?

Mr. CAPELLAS. I have lived here all of my life, since I landed here on that ship, and I have been here all of the time since with the exception of traveling twice to the mainland and twice to the Orient.

Chairman LARCADE. Due to that fact, you are intimately acquainted with all segments of the population here, not only of your own island, but of the entire Territory, are you not?

Mr. CAPELLAS. I am. I would say very much so.

Chairman LARCADE. And would you say that the people of Hawaii, in your opinion, are able to govern themselves according to the general standards of the American way of political and economic life?

Mr. CAPELLAS. Yes, very much so. I would say further that our institutions in Hawaii have all been patterned after mainland institutions, and our educational system has been patterned after the mainland educational systems, so that all our people, of all racial groups, have had the advantage and the privileges of being educated under American ideals, and irrespective of the home lands of the different racial groups that have come to Hawaii, and they came here to better their economic status in the first place, and they have observed these American ideals, and have absorbed the spirit of the land, and have imbibed the Christian ideals which came here with the missionaries when they first landed here, many, many years ago, so that I honestly feel that the people of Hawaii who have governed themselves since the days of Kamehameha I, when he ruled the islands and they were ridden of the tabus, all of the groups, on all the islands, have governed themselves right up until today, and our Territorial laws have to go to Congress to be approved, and up to this date I don't think that a single law passed by our legislature has ever been repudiated by Congress, which is saying something.

Chairman LARCADE. At this point I would like to ask you another question, Senator. In view of the fact that you have been engaged in educational work practically all of your life, at the last hearing that was held, at the Kona schoolhouse, one of the witnesses raised a question as to whether or not in the plebiscite which was held in 1940 when the voters of the Territory voted in a proportion of 2 to 1 in favor of statehood—he questioned the fact as to whether or not the people of the Territory fully understood the question upon which they were voting. Would you be able to make an observation in that respect?

Mr. CAPELLAS. Well, I will be glad to do so. I voted for statehood during the plebiscite. The plebiscite was granted us through the Territorial legislature. Before it became a law, it was discussed throughout this Territory, and was publicized in the newspapers, and when the campaign was on for the plebiscite there were meetings held and discussions held, and I think all the people of this Territory were well versed and were well aware of what it was about. That is, the majority were, and when you talk about your majority I feel that they knew

what they wanted, and that we wanted statehood, and felt we were ready for statehood economically, socially and politically, and in all the ways you may mention, and that Hawaii is well qualified for statehood.

I think Hawaii is better qualified for statehood today than many of the States were at the time that they were admitted into the Union, from being Territories, and as States. The citizenry is here. I don't have to say it; you just look around and meet the people and observe things for yourselves, and you make your own observations, and you will find we are ready for statehood. We may not get it, but if we do not it is not fair. We are in the position of the American Colonies when they generated the Revolutionary War; in a similar position. We pay over \$150,000,000 that goes into the Federal Treasury, and we are paying taxes without having any representation, so we are in a position similar to that of the colonies at that time. We would like to be a State within the United States, so we can vote for our Governor and for Members of Congress, and this is very pertinent when legislation comes up in Congress as it affects the sugar industry, and we want to be in a position where we are going to be able to share and share alike with all the other sugar States on the mainland. We don't want to hurt them, but we believe in democracy, and we want to be treated just the same as the States are treated. They pay money over in revenues to the Federal Government, but they have a full representation in Congress, and we pay over \$150,000,000, which is more than 15 States pay, and yet we have no representative who has any voice in Congress and who can vote for measures that will benefit our Territory.

Chairman LARCADE. I think you have made a very good statement there.

Would you care to make any observations with reference to any other phase of the statehood question? If you care to make a further statement on that, or file a brief, we will be glad to have you do so.

Mr. CAPELLAS. I might file a brief.

Chairman LARCADE. Now, Senator, the committee has received a number of protests in respect to the announced intention of the National Park Service to demand that the recreational center established by the Army at the Hawaii National Park at Kilauea, be closed, and discontinued, and I think the committee, and every Member of Congress, is very much interested in the welfare of the members of our armed forces in every way, and will you, as a member and the president of the Territorial legislature, the senate, make a statement as to whether you have received any protests, and are you acquainted with the benefits which have accrued from the establishment of this recreational center for the men of the armed forces, and what is your opinion with regard to this question?

Mr. CAPELLAS. I thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, for asking me that question. I have been approached by a number of people regarding the closing of the recreational camp for the Army and Navy which is now established at the Hawaii National Park. I feel that since private persons in this Territory established that camp, which was known as the Kilauea Military Camp, for a recreational center for the armed forces, that it should be maintained for that purpose, for providing rest and recreation for the boys of our armed

forces, because there is no place in the whole Territory that could provide a better environment, a better climate, and a better atmosphere, than this camp here in the national park.

These persons who have come to me have protested against its removal, and they had been told, or were informed somehow, that there was a move on among the management of the parks bureau—I don't know what the real name is—to remove this recreational camp to some other area. The only reason given was that it was not desirable to have a military camp in a park area, because they want the park for the park people, and for other purposes, and we the citizens of this county of Hawaii, and who were responsible for the establishment of this camp, we want our boys to continue enjoying that camp, and we want them to continue to use it and develop it so that more and more boys can profit by the accommodations and the facilities therein provided.

Chairman LARCADE. Now, Senator, would you know of any other place in the Territory where a camp could be established that would be more advantageous, or add to the reasons you have cited as to why you think that this is a desirable place for this camp, and would there be any other place that would be more desirable or advantageous or convenient in which to establish such a rest camp for the members of the armed forces in the Territory?

Mr. CAPELLAS. I don't know of a site that can provide as many historical and other places of interest as this present military camp provides. There is not a place in the Territory, and I know the Territory fairly well, as I have traveled all over it, that compares with it, and this is the ideal spot for it. It has a delightful climate.

Chairman LARCADE. You know it to be a fact that many men have taken advantage of its facilities, and as a result it has been most beneficial, not only to the health but to the morale of the men?

Mr. CAPELLAS. Yes, both for the health and for the morale, and I think a good many of our boys who have come here from Honolulu, from Schofield Barracks, come back here three or four times, and when they can go elsewhere if they cared to, and they said after they had been here the first time they wanted to come back to the camp because of the advantages they found here. Major Ulrich, who is with us in this car, I think is in agreement with everything I am saying.

Chairman LARCADE. I think that about covers it, does it not?

Mr. CAPELLAS. Yes, that covers it.

(The Hilo hearing followed this statement, at 3:30 p. m.)

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII

MONDAY, JANUARY 14, 1946

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE TERRITORIES,
Hilo, Hawaii, T. H.

The committee met at 3:37 p. m., Hon. Henry D. Larcade (chairman) presiding.

Present: Representative Henry D. Larcade, Louisiana, Chairman; Representative James J. Delaney, New York, member; Representative George P. Miller, California, member; Representative Dean P. Taylor, New York, member; Representative Homer D. Angell, Oregon, member; Delegate Joseph R. Farrington (Hawaii), member; Irwin W. Silverman, Esq., chief counsel for House Territories Subcommittee; C. Nils Tavares, Esq., attorney general, Hawaii; Dudley C. Lewis, Esq., deputy attorney general, Hawaii.

Chairman LARCADE. The meeting will come to order.

Ladies and gentlemen, this is a subcommittee of the Committee on Territories of the House of Representatives of the United States of America which is visiting the Territory for the purpose of holding hearings and making an investigation with respect to legislation now pending in the Congress of the United States concerning the problems of the Territory.

This meeting has been announced through the press and otherwise, that every citizen who desired to appear before the committee or who desired to make a statement or file a brief, would be welcome to appear before the committee, or to file such a brief or statement. Unfortunately we are behind schedule and it may not be possible to prolong the meeting today as long as might be desired. However, we will try to hear as many witnesses as possible, and those who do not have an opportunity to testify will be requested to file statements or briefs with respect to any subjects now pending and being considered by the Committee.

It is fair to say, however, that the matter of most importance to the people of the Territory at this time is the legislation now pending in Congress with respect to the question of statehood for the Territory of Hawaii.

At this time I would ask Senator Capellas to appear before the committee. And for the benefit of the committee I might state that Senator Capellas has previously made a verbal statement for the record, and he desires the unanimous consent that he might file additional statements or a brief for the record, which opportunity will be accorded to him.

(Verbal statement of Senator Capellas referred to immediately precedes this Hilo session in the transcript of proceedings.)

Chairman LARCADE. I thought perhaps some members of the committee might desire to propound some questions to Senator Capellas, due to the prominent position held by him in this community, and so I have requested him to appear before you.

Are there any questions by members of the committee with respect to statehood, or on any other matters affecting the Territory at this time. The Senator made a very fine statement, I think, for the record, and unfortunately on account of the time element we are unable to have him repeat that statement, but it will be in the record.

Mr. CAPELLAS. We were in the same car coming down from the Volcano House, and the chairman thought it might be best if I made the statement on the way down, so as to give an opportunity to my friends here in Hilo to appear, who are very anxious to appear before this committee, so I made my statement and it is down in the record, and I am to forward a brief in the next day or so to Honolulu.

Chairman LARCADE. Well, I think that will cover the situation. Thank you very much, Senator, and before you leave I want to say on behalf of the committee we want to thank you, both as a Senator of the Territory and in your individual capacity as chairman of the entertainment committee of Hilo for the many fine receptions we have had the pleasure of attending, and for which we are indebted to you and the people of Hilo, and we have enjoyed our stay on this island very much.

Mr. CAPELLAS. Thank you, but the credit for it goes to the people of Hilo.

Chairman LARCADE. Is there anyone who wishes to testify, either in favor of or in opposition, on the question of statehood for Hawaii?

Will you give your name to the reporter, and state your business.

Mr. GUSTAVUS D. SUPE. My name is Gustavus D. Supe, and I was born in Bloomfield, Mich., on the 8th of June 1866.

Chairman LARCADE. What is your business, sir?

Mr. SUPE. I graduated from high school there, and worked as a clerk in my father's business, which was a grocery, and I came to the islands in 1896 as a coffee planter, and later I became a sugar planter, and then I became a dairyman, and then I was a road supervisor, and then I was a supervisor of the county of Hawaii, and then I was a school teacher, and then I was a deputy tax assessor, and then I was deputy county treasurer, and now I am on the retired list.

Chairman LARCADE. You may proceed with your statement.

Mr. SUPE. Very well.

Chairman LARCADE. Do you have a written statement?

Mr. SUPE. No. I have a few notes on what I wish to say. I am not in favor of statehood, because it is not for the benefit of the majority of the people of the islands. If the plebiscite had been held in a proper manner, as it should have been held, with a full discussion of the pros and cons of all the facts, it would have been better. As it was then, we have been for years talking about that we wanted statehood, but nobody knew what statehood meant, and a great many of those who voted in favor of statehood had no idea of what it would amount to. Many statements were made which were false, and there were many things which should have been said which were never brought before the public. The fact there was that we would get two Senators and two or three Representatives in place of the Dele-

gate, who has no vote, and maybe there would be relief for business, but maybe it would not. Many people think that when they have a Senator and he has a vote that all he has to do is to go and say what he wants and then they have it delivered. Then if it works out, good; that is an advantage there, but, on the other hand, when the islands were annexed to the United States, Congress passed what is called the organic act in order to safeguard the people here, and they passed, among other things, an act there by which any bond issue of the Territory would have to be left to a vote of the people before it became effective, but the legislature without any notice to the people changed that so that they now only need the approval of the President of the United States; that is all that is necessary to bond it. With statehood we lose that protection. The legislature of the Territory, or of the State, would be the one to make the final decision on anything unless it were contrary to the Constitution of the United States.

Then another act was that the public utility franchise had to be approved by Congress before they became effective, and that also would go by the board.

Then the Federal Government, as long as we are a Territory, pays a great many of the bills here; they pay the salaries of the Governor, the secretary of the Territory, the circuit court judges, and they contribute \$50,000 to the session of the legislature. What other things they pay, I do not know.

I think before statehood should be acted on there should be a full discussion of the matter, so that all the public could give an intelligent vote. That is all.

Chairman LARCADE. Mr. Farrington, do you have any questions?

Delegate FARRINGTON. No questions.

Chairman LARCADE. Any members of the committee who have any questions? [No response.] Thank you very much.

(Mr. Supe is excused as a witness.)

Chairman LARCADE. Is there any other witness present who would like to make a statement for or against statehood? We would be very glad to hear from any citizen who desires to be heard at this time.

Mr. ROBERT I. BALDWIN. My name is Robert I. Baldwin.

Chairman LARCADE. Will you state your business.

Mr. BALDWIN. I was born in 1898, at Riverside, Calif.; I graduated from Stanford University, and was director of education of American Samoa in 1926 and in January 1927 I became a teacher at the Hilo High School, and I have been there as teacher and librarian since. I have my brief written out here. Shall I hand it in or do you want me to read it? It is brief.

Chairman LARCADE. You may read it.

Mr. BALDWIN (reading): We, the undersigned, before World War No. 2 were not in favor of immediate statehood but now we favor immediate statehood for the following reasons:

1. Because of mechanizing of sugar plantations and because labor unions have become established during the war period we feel that the danger of importation of undesirable foreign labor causing possible social unrest has been lessened.

2. Before the war we were uncertain of just what to expect from the Japanese population but due to their fine showing during the war

and due to the fact that the influence of the old generation is fast disappearing we feel that there is now no hazard from that source.

3. Economic competition in the postwar era will probably be keen. In order to draw mainland capital we need stability guaranteed only by votes in Congress which statehood will give us. Respectfully submitted—it is signed by myself and by my wife, Mrs. Helen S. Baldwin.

Chairman LARCADE. Thank you very much, Mr. Baldwin. You use the term "we". Do you represent only yourself and your wife, or do you represent some organization?

Mr. BALDWIN. No organization; just myself and my wife. We don't speak for anyone else.

Chairman LARCADE. Are there any questions by members of the committee?

Delegate FARRINGTON. I was very much interested in your statement that you were in American Samoa for some years—

Mr. BALDWIN. No; I was there for just a short length of time. I was appointed the director of education from Stanford University in 1926, but there was a mix-up in the contract, and so I was only down there for about 8 weeks.

Delegate FARRINGTON. I was very much interested in your statement comment on the influence that making Hawaii a State would have among the other places in the Pacific, and if, in your opinion, it would strengthen the position of our country among them by creating a new element of good will?

Mr. BALDWIN. Well, one reason why we are in favor of statehood, that I have not mentioned here, and why we should have statehood at this time, is because there has been some agitation to make us keep the Territorial status, or turn us over to the Navy, and I feel very definitely if we attain statehood we will establish our position definitely with the United States Government, and without any threat of anything being done in the future to deviate our position and our status as a State, no matter what efforts there may be to change our form of government, or change the organic act, and it could just as well go backward as forward.

Chairman LARCADE. The chairman is of the opinion you are an exceptionally qualified witness, and I would like to ask you a question: Is it your opinion that when the plebiscite was held in 1940 that the people of the Territory understood the questions, and were able to make their own determination, in voting on the question?

Mr. BALDWIN. As far as I know they did. I am not in a position to discuss it, but as far as I know they did. I felt that it was perfectly fair and equitable, and that the people understood the question at that time, and I think they did understand it as clearly as a group could be expected to understand it. It was well publicized.

Chairman LARCADE. Thank you very much.

(Mr. Baldwin excused as a witness.)

Chairman LARCADE. Is there anyone else who wishes to appear as a witness?

Mr. MICHAEL O. CUNNINGHAM. Yes.

Chairman LARCADE. Give your name and business.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. My name is Michael O. Cunningham, and I am a police officer of the county of Hawaii, and I was born on these islands, on June 4, 1920, on Kauai, and I have lived here 26 years, and during

my experience here on Hawaii I worked here in Hilo, and later I was employed by the Federal Government at the Navy Yard, Pearl Harbor, on Oahu, and I would like to discuss something here which will take 10 minutes if you will give me the time.

Chairman LARCADE. You may proceed.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I am 100 per cent for statehood. I am a laboring man and I am for the labor movement 100 per cent, and I am tired of the rule we have in Hawaii. We are held down in bondage by a group of people. I am trying to unionize the Hawaii County Police Department under a no-strike pledge, and we feel, sincerely, we are faced with injustice, and that is what we face in these islands. I am 100 percent for statehood, and may we have justice, because that is what I think we will get if we have statehood for these islands, which will allow us to elect our own governor, as was said in the statements made before, and now we have an unconstitutional democracy—we have no real representation in Congress as the States do.

We have an oligarchy here; that is the set-up we have here in these islands. If we are American citizens of the United States, you, most honorable Congressmen, are our last hope. One more State added to the union surely cannot change the American ways and the American standards of life. I thank you.

Chairman LARCADE. Are there any questions by members of the committee? [No response.]

Do you represent any organization of any kind, or union, or do you appear in your individual capacity as a citizen?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Honorable Congressman, I have tried to state my relations to the city and county, for the Municipal Workers of America, which is a union affiliated with the CIO, who are for statehood, and this union is going through a hard process; I am endeavoring and striving to make the Hawaii Police Security Club a lever by which we can change the set-up, and with such an organization we feel as long as we have a no-strike pledge we feel that is all that is necessary for maintaining constitutional rights.

Representative DELANEY. Your argument is that one more State added to the Union would not do any harm. That is not a very strong argument.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. That one more State would not change the American ideals or ways of life. Our group wants it.

Representative DELANEY. Suppose there was a small community like Samoa or Guam, and they came out for statehood; do you favor that they should be admitted?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. At the present time I would not like to discuss anywhere outside of these islands. At the present time I will not make any hypothetical case. I say that you must have a test case, and that should be right out here in Hawaii, and then we will have our conclusions.

Chairman LARCADE. Are there any further questions? [No response.] Thank you very much.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Thank you, Honorable Congressmen, and the peace-loving people of these islands.

(Mr. Cunningham excused as a witness.)

Chairman LARCADE. I recognize this gentleman—will you come forward and state your name and your business to the reporter.

Mr. JOSEPH G. ANDREWS. My name is Joseph G. Andrews, and I was born in the Territory of Hawaii. I was elected to the legislature in the session of 1943, and again in the session of 1945. I wish to present a brief on behalf of Representative William J. Payne, who was unable to attend.

Chairman LARCADE. Without objection, the committee will be glad to have you do so.

Mr. ANDREWS. It has reference more to the land laws revision.

Chairman LARCADE. It will be made a part of the record, without objection.

(Mr. Andrews presented a brief of William J. Payne, Representative, first district, Territorial legislature, dated January 11, 1946, Hilo, Hawaii, reading as follows:)

To the Congressional Subcommittee on Statehood and Land Laws Revision:

I believe the present land laws in Hawaii should be changed in a great many instances and I will present a few.

In the first place the word "may" should be changed to "shall."

At present the land commissioner is a "Little Hitler." He may do this and he may do that. I think it is wrong to give that power to one man.

The land laws when enacted should not be left to one man's dictation.

World War II was fought so that we could get away from just that.

The 1945 Territorial legislature enacted legislation on rent control so that indiscriminate rentals could not be charged, yet right there in Hilo at Ocean View, the rentals of 17 government house lots—each lot about one-seventh of an acre—was increased 10 times its former upset price from \$25 a year to \$245 a year. This was done by the land commissioner and his commissioners. What can the people think if we allow them to get away with it?

Right here on this island there are thousands of acres of Government land available for house lots.

In Hilo there is enough Government land suitable for house lots, with utilities available, to satisfy all those who want home sites.

In the past the few lots that were up for sale were set at such a high upset price that the man with a limited income was unable to compete.

The Government has a large area of land suitable for ranching but when these lands are put up for lease, they are in such large areas, that here again the small ranches has no chance. Some of these ranch lands should be cut up into, say, 250 acre lots, thereby giving the small ranchers a chance to bid.

Chairman LARCADE. You may proceed. Do you wish to express your views on statehood?

Mr. ANDREWS. I have no comment to make on whether Hawaii is to be the forty-ninth State or not, other than to reverse the situation, and I think we should have your honorable body of your Congress make a statement as to why we have not been granted statehood.

Chairman LARCADE. That is not the purpose of the meeting here. We are to take testimony as to whether or not you people are for statehood. We are not here to explain why Hawaii has not been made the forty-ninth State. Have you any comments to make?

Mr. ANDREWS. I didn't expect the committee to answer the question, but to be good enough to present it to Congress, because we all of us in Hawaii have been for statehood for so many years back, and every legislature has presented a resolution to Congress asking them for statehood, but the request has always been turned down, and there are people now who are wondering just why it is, and all that, and I am just asking for your excuse.

Chairman LARCADE. We are not here to answer questions but to ask questions. You can file a brief or a statement, or make a statement now, if you so desire.

Mr. ANDREWS. I wish to state in the 1945 session of the legislature a resolution was addressed to the Congress to allow us to vote for our Governor, and I was one of the proponents of the bill.

Now I want to present a brief on the price of sugar, concerning small land owners, and instead of reading it I have made copies of it and will submit it.

Chairman LARCADE. Without exception the brief will be made a part of the record, and accepted for the record.

(Document offered is marked "Exhibit No. 50-A and 50-B.")

Mr. ANDREWS. Now I wish to take up the land laws revision. I have also a brief prepared on that, which I will present to the Committee, instead of presenting argument on it.

Chairman LARCADE. On what subject is that?

Mr. ANDREWS. On the Land Laws Revision.

Chairman LARCADE. We will be glad to have you file that, without objection by the committee.

(Document offered is marked "Exhibit No. 51.")

Chairman LARCADE. Are you in favor of or against statehood for the Territory?

Mr. ANDREWS. Well, I am in favor of it if the people are educated to this possibility, the probability that taxes will be increased considerably, and if the tax-load now is so tremendous that the little fellow is screaming and big industry is screaming, I don't see how we are going to be able to finance it without increasing the tax rate and the tax valuations of the whole Territory.

Here in Hawaii, the tax assessor gave us a report for the 1945 legislature that the plantations on this island had their assessed valuation remain as it was—the same as the year previous, whereas the home owners of this county had their assessed valuation increased \$1,000,000. Now that is included in my suggested revision there, in the brief, and I feel that the people should first be relieved. They should understand if they want to live on a champagne diet they will have to pay for it. As it is now, it is pretty tough, and that is the only point—not an objection, but it is a matter of educating the public to the fact that they will have to pay for the champagne dinners if they want to have it.

Chairman LARCADE. Don't you think that the increased benefits of government, with maybe some additional taxation to establish those divisions of government for your local self-government, in addition to giving you more representative government by having representatives in Washington—more effective representation, by having two United States Senators and Congressmen, would offset the additional cost?

Mr. ANDREWS. As far as the outside districts are concerned, I feel that they will be left in the lurch. In other words, the reapportionment will affect the outside districts. Of course it is natural that Honolulu should try to gain all the advantages possible, because reapportionment will give them a great deal to say about what we on the outside islands will have to accept. I am not against statehood, really, when you come right down to it.

Representative DELANEY. You don't object to that point, do you; proper reapportionment?

Mr. ANDREWS. Well, as it is today we have to fight terribly hard to be recognized by having the Honolulu delegation help us out. This

island especially has been up against it financially, and only last year we were successful in bringing enough money back here to finance this county successfully.

Chairman LARCADE. Are there any further questions by members of the committee?

Mr. Farrington, did you have any questions?

Delegate FARRINGTON. None.

Mr. ANDREWS. Thank you, gentlemen; thank you very much.

(Mr. Andrews is excused as a witness.)

Chairman LARCADE. Are there any other witnesses who desire to appear before the Committee at this time?

Mr. WILLIAM J. NOBRIGA. I would like to appear here.

Chairman LARCADE. Give your name and business, and background.

Mr. NOBRIGA. My name is William J. Nobriga. I was born and raised in Hawaii, and educated in the public schools of Hawaii, and I served as a school teacher and principal for some 11 years. I was elected to the 1943 and 1945 session of the legislature, and I am in business in Hilo, and manager of the Hilo Dairymens' Center, and a junior partner in the Nobriga Ranch Enterprises. I have a statement here which I would like to read; it would take me about 6 minutes.

Chairman LARCADE. You may proceed.

Mr. NOBRIGA. Hawaii is ready for statehood. The important question at issue today is whether or not the Territory of Hawaii is qualified to be admitted as the forty-ninth State of the Union. It is my feeling that this Territory qualifies in every respect—economically, politically, educationally and socially—that the people of Hawaii are capable of self-government; that they are competent to handle their own affairs as a citizen of a State. On the basis of the statehood plebiscite held in 1940, the majority of the people have demonstrated that they want to be elevated to statehood.

Hawaii is an incorporated Territory—an integral part, not a possession of the United States. If we are to be consistent, if we are to be progressive, if we are to capitalize on the principles for which we fought this war, then we believe we are justified in asking for immediate admission to statehood.

You will discover in all your findings that the Territory of Hawaii is better prepared than most of the States when they first applied for admission; and I will venture to say that Hawaii today compares favorably in its qualifications with the respective States.

For your information I will present certain specific relative qualifications:

(1) The Territory of Hawaii is larger in area than the States of Rhode Island, Delaware, and Connecticut. Its population is greater than four States in the Union: Vermont, Wyoming, Delaware, and Nevada.

(2) Eight-five percent of Hawaii's population was born within Hawaii or other parts of the United States.

(3) In 1945 the internal revenue payments from Hawaii to the Treasury of the United States exceeded 14 States.

(4) In the per capita purchase of E-bonds throughout the war, Hawaii ranked first with the States and other Territories.

(5) Over 33,000 citizens of Hawaii of a total population of half a million served in the armed forces in this war.

(6) The Territorial legislature has been progressive in passing sound and beneficial legislation. Its tax structure is modern. The gross income system of taxation is so advanced that many States have made inquiries as to its application.

(7) We have passed many laws which benefit labor in general as the child-labor law, Workmen's Compensation Act, Little Wagner Act, the minimum labor law and the Unemployment Compensation Act.

There are many mutual advantages both to the Union and the Territory by statehood. By granting Hawaii statehood the Union will gain certain benefits:

(1) The Congress of the United States is morally obligated to extend Hawaii this privilege of statehood as we have been an incorporated Territory for 46 years, and have met all our obligations and assumed our responsibilities under the terms of the organic act.

(2) The Federal Government will gain financially in its administrative costs in Hawaii.

(3) The free inter-mingling of the various races and their harmonious relationship prevalent in these islands which serves as an example of the true spirit of Americanism and the democratic way of life can be of tremendous influence in promulgating a better understanding of the cosmopolitan racial composition of the Union.

Hawaii has much to gain by statehood status:

(1) The citizens of Hawaii are citizens of the United States, yet we do not enjoy the security and certain privileges now extended to those born and living in the continental United States.

(2) We will gain self-government; the right to choose all our public officials, representation with taxation, a vote instead of only a voice in the Congress of the United States, and assurance against economic discrimination.

We should have the right to pass our own laws without having to go to Congress.

As a member of the Territorial legislature, I have found that because the organic act reserves the power to Congress relative to changes in the land laws, that this serves as a handicap in enacting proper legislation to bring about better use and more equitable distribution of our lands in the Territory.

Because our Territorial land laws are about 40 years' behind the times, during the 1943 session I introduced House Joint Resolution No. 7, which created the Land Laws Revisions Commission. A report was made by the commission to the 1945 session, which several other legislators and I felt was not comprehensive and did not cover the complete problem. The commission stated that two years was not sufficient to complete the investigations, and recommended another period; they recommended that the commissioner be empowered to continue their work another 2 years. This was done. However, it was felt that the commissioners could have completed the survey during that period so that a report could be transmitted to Congress now, in order that the necessary changes could be acted upon immediately.

By statehood, or Congress granting us the power to pass our own

land laws, many of the land problems now facing the Territory could be easily corrected by the local legislature.

In conclusion, I wish to reiterate that the Territory of Hawaii is ready for statehood, and it is hoped that the Congress of the United States and the people of our mainland are ready to render us fair consideration.

Chairman LARCADE. Are there are questions by members of the committee? Mr. Farrington?

Delegate FARRINGTON. I would like to ask Mr. Nobriga one question: That is, if in his opinion public sentiment on the island of Hawaii on the question of statehood is much the same now as it was during the time of the plebiscite of 1940, or whether it has changed in any respect.

Mr. NOBRIGA. In my observation I feel that there are more for statehood now than there were then.

Chairman LARCADE. Thank you very much, Mr. Nobriga.

(Mr. Nobriga excused as a witness.)

Chairman LARCADE. Is there anyone else who desires to testify, either for or in opposition to statehood? If so, we would be glad to have any citizen appear at this time before the committee.

Mr. TOM T. OKINO. Mr. Chairman, I would like to appear as a witness.

Chairman LARCADE. Give your name, and your business.

Mr. OKINO. My name is Tom T. Okino. I was born here in the city of Hilo. I'm an American of Japanese ancestry. I was educated in the public schools of this Territory of Hawaii, and thereafter, in 1925, I matriculated at Oberlin College near the city of Cleveland, Ohio. In 1929, after spending 4 years at Oberlin College, I enrolled at the Harvard Law School, Cambridge, Mass., and I graduated in the year 1932, and returned to the Territory of Hawaii. I was admitted to the practice of law in all the courts of the Territory of Hawaii. During the latter part of the year 1932, after I was admitted to the practice of law, I was engaged in the practice of private law, and in July of 1934 I was appointed a district magistrate in one of the districts on this island of Hawaii. I resigned that office, after serving in that office until December 31 of 1938, and on January the 2d of the following year, 1939, I was appointed by the county attorney for the county of Hawaii, that is this island, to serve as his deputy county attorney. I served in that office until October 20 of last year, 1945, and I was appointed by the board of supervisors of this county of Hawaii to serve the remainder of the term when my predecessor, the county attorney, was appointed by President Truman to preside as the judge of this third circuit court.

With reference to the question of statehood, I appeared before the body of Congressmen, who were here just like you, 10 years ago, and that hearing was held on October 11, 1935. I was for statehood then, and my sentiment has not changed today. I am for statehood.

I have here with me a booklet published by the subcommittee of the Committee of Territories of the House of Representatives, of the Seventy-fourth Congress, of a hearing held from October 7 to October 18, 1935, and it was printed at the Government Printing Office at Washington in 1936.

Chairman LARCADE. Your testimony appears as it was presented at that hearing?

Mr. OKINO. Yes, my testimony appears at that hearing, and I would like to refer briefly to that report, and enlarge upon it in accordance with recent developments.

Chairman LARCADE. In view of the fact that your testimony is already a part of the record of the House of Representatives, of the committee, it would not be in order to repeat any of that testimony, except for references, which we would be very glad to have you bring your ideas on this question of statehood up to date, and to make any other statements or observations that you may wish to make.

Did you appear before the committee which visited Hawaii, the subcommittee of the Committee on Territories, in 1940?

Mr. OKINO. Yes, sir; I did.

Chairman LARCADE. Well, your statements then made are likewise made a part of that record, and it is available for the committee and Members of Congress for further study, and in view of the little time that we have left at our disposal, at this time may I suggest that you confine your further testimony to bringing your testimony previously given up to date, and to making any other statements or observations that you may desire to make at this time.

Mr. OKINO. I shall do that, Mr. Chairman.

About 10 years ago, the problem of the existence of the Japanese language schools was an impediment to Hawaii, and to Hawaii's case for statehood. At that time I made this statement, which is just one sentence. May I read it, in order that I may proceed?

Chairman LARCADE. Yes.

Mr. OKINO (reading):

Eventually I believe that the Japanese language school will cease to exist.

My belief then has been substantiated by the facts, which have occurred subsequent to that hearing. Today on this island, the island of Hawaii, we have no Japanese language schools, and I believe it is safe for me to say that there is no Japanese language school in the whole Territory of Hawaii.

Many people have recorded that the existence of such foreign language schools was an obstruction or an impediment to Americanization. That fear today, I believe, has been eradicated, because in my opinion such language schools will not return to this Territory of Hawaii.

I also said at that time we are very proud to be and remain American citizens. We have homes and we have lands in fee simple in Hawaii. Our hearts are inseparably rooted here, and I feel it to be true, and I plead with you that American citizens of Japanese ancestry be given the opportunity to prove true to the principles of American democracy. There has been considerable talk about the loyalty of this minority group in the Territory of Hawaii. We feel that this group has established a prima facie case, and we feel that all benefit of the doubt in this respect should be resolved in their favor, rather than against them. I base this statement on the records established by the One Hundredth Infantry Battalion, who fought the battles in Italy. They were made up of Americans of Japanese ancestry from the Territory of Hawaii, and they were inducted prior to December 7, 1941.

I also refer you to the extraordinary records of the Four Hundred and Forty-second Regiment, organized entirely of volunteers, from the Americans of Japanese ancestry. They also served in Italy and in southern France.

We also have the record of the volunteers from the Americans of Japanese ancestry who were attached with the intelligence units, to serve as interpreters, and to elicit whatever information of a military character they could from the Jap prisoners of war.

I believe the war records in the depository at the University of Hawaii will show what the men of Japanese ancestry who have not been enlisted contributed toward the war efforts.. Here on this island of Hawaii, under the auspices of our military commander, an organization was created under the name of the Menehune Minute Men, all being Americans of Japanese ancestry, and including alien Japanese, who sacrificed many hours during Saturday afternoons and on Sundays, and they did go out along the shore line to install and string up barbed wire as coast defenses. On Kauai we had a cadet corps unit, and I will not elaborate in detail, because all those records are kept by the war records depository at the University of Hawaii, where they are available.

There is just one more thing I would like to say at this time. If Hawaii should ever become a State, and if I were to attain—or if I could attain the character of a statesman like our Delegate, the Honorable Joseph Farrington, to receive the necessary votes to become a Congressman, then I would like to be a Congressman. If that should ever occur, and if I did go to Washington, I go there, gentleman, as an American, and not a Japanese, because I am an American.

Chairman LARCADE. Thank you.

Do you have any children, Mr. Okino?

Mr. OKINO. Yes; I have three children.

Chairman LARCADE. How old are they?

Mr. OKINO. The oldest one is a daughter, 11 years of age, and who is attending one of the public schools here on Hawaii. She is in the sixth grade. And the second child is 8 years old, and he is a boy. He is attending public school here. He is in the third grade. And I have the latest one, who is still an infant, and is only about 3 years of age.

Chairman LARCADE. Thank you. Are there any questions by the members of the committee?

(No response.)

Mr. OKINO. Thank you.

Chairman LARCADE. Thank you very much. That is a very fine statement.

(Mr. Okino excused as a witness.)

Chairman LARCADE. Are there any other witnesses who desire to appear?

Mrs. DUNCAN CAMPBELL. I have a few words to say, Mr. Chairman, that might be of interest, if you have time to hear me.

Chairman LARCADE. Yes. Will you give your name and business to the clerk.

Mrs. DUNCAN CAMPBELL. I am Mrs. Duncan Campbell, from Oookala on this island. I am a housewife. I am a graduate of the University of Iowa. I have taught in the islands for many years.

I think there is something that I have observed that perhaps other people have not had an opportunity to observe, and that is in relation to the elections in the schools. Our students are given an opportunity to have their own officers, and we ask them not to be afraid to get up and talk and to say what they think, and so I think I should practice what I am taught. It is not easy, as you know. But I have heard a great deal of talking about how these people of Japanese ancestry, and so forth, will vote, if there is statehood, and I have noticed in the schools that the children, many of them of Japanese ancestry, will vote for the best man or the best girl, whether she is Portuguese, whether she is of German ancestry; whether she is of English ancestry, or even Scotch, or if she is also of Japanese ancestry, or the same in the case of a boy.

Children, the same as adults, recognize intelligence, and I feel that they reflect the views and habits of the adults, in appreciating the ideality of the American Government. I thank you.

Chairman LARCADE. I thank you very much for that very fine statement.

Are there any further witnesses who wish to be heard at this time for or against statehood for Hawaii?

(No response.)

Chairman LARCADE. There being no further statements to be offered by any citizen present, we will now proceed to close the meeting.

We wish to thank the people for their fine reception accorded us here, and the large and attentive audience, and we desire to say that if any citizen desires to file a statement that the committee will be glad to have them do so, on the subject of statehood for Hawaii. Statements should be forwarded to the committee in Honolulu. We will be in Honolulu from Tuesday morning to Friday evening, and the statements received will be filed in the record of the proceedings of the committee.

We now stand adjourned.

(The meeting was adjourned at 4:29 p. m., Monday, January 14, 1946.)

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII

TUESDAY, JANUARY 15, 1946

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE TERRITORIES,
Honolulu, Hawaii, T. H.

The committee met at 10 a. m., Hon. Henry D. Larcade (chairman) presiding.

Present: Representative Henry D. Larcade, Louisiana, chairman; Representative James J. Delaney, New York, member; Representative George P. Miller, California, member; Representative Dean P. Taylor, New York, member; Representative Homer D. Angell, Oregon, member; Delegate Joseph R. Farrington (Hawaii), member; Irwin W. Silverman, Esq., chief counsel for House Territories Subcommittee; C. Nils Tavares, Esq., attorney general, Hawaii; Dudley C. Lewis, Esq., deputy attorney general, Hawaii.

Chairman LARCADE. The meeting will come to order. As you know, this committee has been holding hearings here all during last week, at which time the proponents were represented by Judge Robertson, of the equal rights commission, a legislative commission created by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, who appointed Judge Robertson to present the case of the Territory for admission as a State in the Union. Judge Robertson's presentation was interrupted because certain people who were opposed to statehood requested that they be given an opportunity to appear, because they had other business. So, since all of those who made that request have appeared, and we desire to try and close the presentation of the case of the equal rights commission, through Judge Robertson, we will this morning endeavor to complete that presentation through Judge Robertson on behalf of the equal rights commission. Thereafter, we will proceed with the regular program, and will give all citizens, both for and against statehood, an opportunity to appear before the committee or present statements or briefs for the record.

I also wish to call to your attention again that, at the request of numerous citizens who were unable to appear before the committee during the hours of the hearings during the day, that we have set aside a special period, beginning at 8 o'clock tonight, to give all of those an opportunity to appear before the committee who have been unable to appear before the committee during the daytime.

At this time the chairman yields the Chair to the Honorable James Delaney, from New York.

(Representative Delaney takes the Chair.)

Chairman DELANEY. The Chair recognizes Judge Robertson.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I would like, first, Mr. Chairman, to present some written statements. I would like to present a resolution adopted by

the Hawaiian Civic Club favoring immediate statehood. [Exhibit No. 52.]

I would also like to file a resolution adopted by the Hawaiian Government Employees Association, favoring immediate statehood. [Exhibit No. 53.]

I would also like to file a declaration made by the Filipino Federation of America declaring in favor of statehood. [Exhibit No. 54.]

Chairman DELANEY. Without objection, we will take them as part of the record.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I have also, Mr. Chairman, some matters, most of which have been called for during the hearing by the committee, which I would now like to file. The first is a statement of the Public Utilities Commission, prepared by Mr. V. B. Libbey, chairman. [Statement No. 10.]

Next is a compilation of the rail line operating statistics of steam railroads in this Territory. [Exhibit No. 55.]

Next is a comparative statement of the net paid newspaper circulation of leading newspapers in cities of similar size. [Exhibit No. 56.]

The next is a statement prepared by William Borthwick, tax commissioner, showing the schedule of the real property rates per thousand for the county. [Exhibit No. 57.]

The next is a statement of information regarding health conditions in the Territory of Hawaii, prepared by the Territorial health department. [Exhibits No. 58 A-E.]

The next is a statement of the civilian consumption of fluid milk and cream, prepared by the Agricultural Extension Service of the University of Hawaii. [Exhibit No. 59.]

The next is certain correspondence relative to the Morale Section of the Office of Military Governor. [Exhibits No. 60 A-C.]

Chairman DELANEY. Any objections? (No response.) Without objection, it's so ordered.

Mr. ROBERTSON. We now present Mr. Heaton L. Wrenn, president of the Bar Association of Hawaii.

Chairman DELANEY. Mr. Wrenn.

Mr. WRENN. I am Heaton L. Wrenn. I have been a resident of the Territory of Hawaii for the past 22 years. I was educated in the public schools of the State of California. I am a graduate of Stanford University and of Stanford Law School. I am a member of the Bar of the State of California, the Bar of the Territory of Hawaii, the several Federal courts, including the Supreme Court of the United States. I am a member of the law firm of Anderson, Wrenn & Jenks. At the present time I am president of the Bar Association of Hawaii.

I have handed to the clerk a resolution of the Bar Association of Hawaii, adopted at a meeting held on January 4, 1946, unanimously recommending immediate admission of Hawaii into the Union as a State. I ask that that be made a part of the record.

Chairman DELANEY. Without objection, so ordered.

(The document was received and marked "Exhibit No. 61".)

Mr. WRENN. I have prepared a rather—

Chairman DELANEY. Won't you have a seat, Mr. Wrenn?

Mr. WRENN. I have prepared a rather lengthy statement, which I have also given to the clerk, and in lieu of reading it to you, I know

you have lots of business to attend to, I'd like to have that made a matter of record in this hearing.

Chairman DELANEY. So ordered, without objection.

(The document was received and marked "Statement No. 11.")

Mr. WRENN. The thesis of my paper is simply this: That Hawaii has demonstrated by the type of legislation that it has passed, which, in my opinion, is constructive, progressive, and intelligent, its capacity for self-government. To me, it is one of the most cogent evidences on the record, one of the most important things to be considered by the committee in determining whether Hawaii should be admitted to the Union as a State. I won't go into an analysis of that legislation. It's all set forth in this statement, which presents an over-all picture.

Chairman DELANEY. Are there any comments upon your statement, any high lights that you wish to stress for the attention of the committee?

Mr. WRENN. Well, I might say, in passing, that shortly after admission Hawaii adopted legislation providing for a uniform laws commission, and during the past 45 years has adopted some 20 uniform laws. In 1903 Hawaii adopted the Torrance title system for the Territory of Hawaii, which has been a very fine thing in straightening out land titles in the territory. It's modeled after the Massachusetts law.

Early in its history, to wit, the history of the Territory of 1901, Hawaii adopted an income-tax law. In 1896 it adopted one that was held unconstitutional in 1897. Since 1901 Hawaii adopted many types of progressive tax legislation. There are hardly any fields of taxation that the legislature has overlooked.

One of the things that is outstanding, from my point of view, is the endeavor on the part of the legislature to assert fundamental phases of government out of politics, in an endeavor to have them function efficiently. In this respect, they have adopted legislation creating a police commission for the city and county of Honolulu. They have also adopted legislation creating police commissions for the several counties in the Territory. The Honolulu Sewer and Water Commission has done a wonderful job. Today we have one of the best water systems in the country, the functions of the system being largely due to the nonpolitical organization.

You have been probably told about the board of health. If not, you will probably be told about it. The public utilities commission,—and there are several other commissions which have done outstanding work,—creatures of the legislature, demonstrating, in my opinion, the feeling of legislative responsibility that the legislature of Hawaii has had during the past 45 years.

Chairman DELANEY. Just this thought, Mr. Wrenn: From the testimony we heard here, most of those who testify seemed to feel that statehood would help Hawaii. Now can you demonstrate for those folks who are back on the mainland what benefit Hawaii would be to the States of the Union, and how they may benefit as a result of Hawaii being made the forty-ninth State?

Mr. WRENN. Well, of course, the bringing of this progressive community into the fold of the other States, would certainly improve, in my opinion, the political and the economic status of the Territory, which would reflect beneficially to the other States of the Union.

Hawaii today, of course, is a part of the American Union, and the States are today enjoying the taxes that are paid into the Treasury of the United States, enjoying the fruits of industry and the endeavors of the people here. I don't know how better to answer your question, Mr. Chairman, than to say that adding an additional State to the Union with the strength that Hawaii has can't help but improve the strength of this Union from an economic and a political point of view.

Chairman DELANEY. Well, for the sake of argument, let's assume that Hawaii has demonstrated its ability to manage its own affairs beyond any doubt. If some of the other possessions or islands were to likewise demonstrate their ability to manage their own affairs, particularly islands, would you say that they should be accepted as a State?

Mr. WRENN. Why, certainly, I wouldn't advocate statehood for Hawaii and not advocate it for others who had entitled themselves to it, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman DELANEY. That's the very question I want to get at, Mr. Wrenn. Now we, as a committee, in the event that we see fit to recommend that Hawaii be admitted as the forty-ninth State, will have to advocate that before the entire Congress, and there we will be met with opposition from someone; we can anticipate some opposition. We would have to be in a position to answer all of their arguments. Now, anticipating that someone should raise that question, we would have to agree with them, as you did, is that right?

Mr. WRENN. Certainly, if they were able to demonstrate their ability to govern themselves in the same plane that Hawaii has, they would be entitled to serious consideration for statehood.

Chairman DELANEY. Don't you think, from a political standpoint, that there might be serious objection on the part of admitting all such islands or Territories?

Mr. WRENN. I'm not advocating—I'm not admitting for a minute that there are other Territories which are similarly situated. From my knowledge of the islands of the Pacific I doubt very seriously whether there are, or will be, others who are similarly situated. But just assuming that there were, where could there be any political disadvantage in admitting them to the Union?

Chairman DELANEY. Now, we are forgetting the possibility of just such an argument, just such a discussion as you and I are having now, but instead of it being here in Hawaii it's on the floor of Congress, and we are confronted with the question by one of the other Congressmen—size is not a necessary element, will you agree with that statement?

Mr. WRENN. Certainly.

Chairman DELANEY. Suppose, for the sake of argument, that Samoa had demonstrated beyond any question its ability to meet with all the requirements that Hawaii has, and petition Congress for admission to the Union as an additional State, would you say that they should be accepted?

Mr. WRENN. I don't see why not. Except that when you said a minute ago that size wasn't an element, to me when you compare Samoa with Hawaii I think that it is, in my opinion, too small to

justify consideration for statehood, both from a population point of view and from the area point of view.

Chairman DELANEY. That's just the question I wanted to arrive at. What is the measure, then, for accepting a Territory or a possession as a State?

Mr. WRENN. Well, one of the things to take into consideration in measuring it is the capacity of the people for self-government.

Chairman DELANEY. We have conceded that for the sake of argument.

Mr. WRENN. That, to me, is the most important thing. The other question is, how have they succeeded during the past years in building themselves up economically, politically, and socially? Now those standards are very hard to make the rules of thumb, and I don't see how you can consider it from an abstract point of view. It seems to me that it is going to depend on the facts of the case. They are going to have to be measured just like you gentlemen are investigating the situation here, and the committees before you investigated the situation here. But when you go before Congress and they ask you what's going to happen if other people come along, if others do get into the position where they are similarly situated, it seems to me there is one thing to be remembered.

One of the things that this war was fought over was to give people who are capable of self-government the right to govern themselves, the protection of the Constitution. We fought the war to give that to people from other countries, and if peoples under the American flag are capable of demonstrating their ability to govern themselves, not only from the point of view of the laws that they pass, but from the point of view of the way in which they have advanced economically, politically, and socially, they are certainly entitled to serious consideration for statehood. I say that advisedly, because I don't think that any Territory under the American flag is politically, or economically secure without being a State.

Chairman DELANEY. Don't you think that our strongest argument would be, well, first, that there already exists between the Territory of Hawaii and the United States of America a solemn agreement and a pact; and, secondly, the fact that you have the obligations of the citizens of the States on the mainland, that you have to pay your Federal taxes? It would seem to me that those two points would be very strong in favor of admitting Hawaii.

Mr. WRENN. Yes; but I am assuming that when, for the purposes of the question that you put to me, that at the time they came up for consideration of statehood they could be in a situation similar to Hawaii. I don't think that anyone can read the history of negotiation with respect to the annexation of Hawaii without feeling very deeply that there is an obligation on behalf, on the part of the United States to extend to the Territory of Hawaii all of the benefits of statehood.

Chairman DELANEY. Any questions?

Delegate FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask Mr. Wrenn a few questions by way of developing his point of view along the same line of inquiry that you were making. Isn't it true, Mr. Wrenn, that the question of whether or not Hawaii should become a state ultimately

was really determined by Congress in 1900, when they gave us a Territorial form of government and incorporated us into the Union?

Mr. WRENN. I am convinced of that, Mr. Farrington.

Delegate FARRINGTON. Isn't it true also that American Samoa and Guam and Puerto Rico, to say nothing of the Philippines, have never been incorporated in the Union?

Mr. WRENN. That's correct.

Delegate FARRINGTON. And that the people of American Samoa and Guam are still today without American citizenship and virtually no civil rights, isn't that correct?

Mr. WRENN. I wouldn't go that far.

Delegate FARRINGTON. Well, I know it is correct. And I merely introduce the statement for purposes of clarifying this picture, this particular issue. And now, in the development of our country, some 29 of the States served a period of tutelage as Territories before they were admitted as States. On the basis of that experience doesn't it stand to reason that the Union of States is going to derive strength from the admission of Hawaii as a State as much as it has from the admission of other Territories?

Mr. WRENN. Yes, sir.

Delegate FARRINGTON. And isn't it true also that as a result of this war, America's position in the Pacific has been enormously strengthened, that we are confronting a period where our leadership will be challenged as it never has been before, and that this Territory, with more than 100 years of experience in dealing with the problems of the Pacific, can bring to their solution by voting representation in Congress the point of view that is exceptionally well informed, and probably very enlightened and much to the advantage of our common country?

Mr. WRENN. That's quite true, Mr. Farrington. I feel, in addition, that it would add to the prestige of Hawaii in handling the problems in the Pacific if it were handling them as a State rather than as a Territory.

Delegate FARRINGTON. What I am trying to develop is the advantages that will come to the country as a whole by the admission of Hawaii as a State. There is no question that it will be of advantage to the Territory also. Isn't it true that if we become a State the Territory will assume the costs of the executive and administrative branches that are now maintained, so far as the salaries of the officials are concerned, by the Federal Government?

Mr. WRENN. That's true.

Delegate FARRINGTON. Isn't it true also that the Territory will have to pay its own legislature?

Mr. WRENN. That's true.

Delegate FARRINGTON. I think that's all.

Representative MILLER. Mr. Wrenn, developing further some of the matters that Mr. Delaney brought out, as I remember my geography and history, and I'm certainly weak on both of them, the only other islands in the Pacific that are under the American flag are Samoa, Guam, then a few small islands such as Wake, Midway, Johnston Island, one of which is at least a part, for administrative purposes, of the city and county of Honolulu, and that Guam and Samoa, which are the two biggest, are each about as big as the island of Molokai?

Mr. WRENN. I think that's right.

Representative MILLER. And that they haven't even the resources for potential development that the Island of Molokai has?

Mr. WRENN. That's my understanding.

Representative MILLER. I may be wrong, as I say, that those are the only islands other than these smaller islands that are merely atolls or stepping stones that have no economy—Wake, Midway, or Johnston—no possibility of development of the economy that could even potentially be considered as Territories under the thesis that you have developed. That's the way I feel about it. I was trying to—perhaps you could develop this theory: As a matter of practice the only other islands under the American flag today, to which the rule could apply, would be Tutuila and Guam.

Representative ANGELL. Mr. Wrenn, considering the advantages of statehood, and of course there are two problems to be considered—one, the advantages the Territory itself might derive from being admitted to the Union, and the other is what the other States in the Union, continental United States, might derive. In considering that question is it not quite proper also to consider the fact that if the Territory is admitted to the Union there will be two United States Senators from this Territory who will be seated in the Senate, the upper House of the Congress, who will be in a position to advise and consult with and to vote upon the various problems that will confront this Nation in the years that are to follow, and likewise, in the House of Representatives there will also be full-fledged representation. Isn't that a very distinct advantage to the United States as a whole, leaving aside the advantages the Territory might derive?

Mr. WRENN. I should think so, Mr. Angell. I don't think there is any question about that.

Representative ANGELL. Do you feel that the Territory will occupy a less strategic place in the defense of the Americas in the years to come than it has in the preceding years?

Mr. WRENN. The point of view of defense against war?

Representative ANGELL. That's it, defending the United States in the event that another war may come upon us in the future.

Mr. WRENN. Why I certainly don't think it occupies a less strategic place. How strategic it is will depend upon what the modern implements or the future implements of war will be.

Representative ANGELL. Considering the problem from that standpoint, would it not be of distinct advantage to the United States as a whole, then, to have in the Congress and in both branches men from this area who are steeped in the history of this particular area, and who know the problems perhaps much better than the rest of us in the Congress, to have their advice with respect to the defense of this country in the long drag down through the centuries?

Mr. WRENN. Most decidedly.

Representative ANGELL. Do you not think, as a matter of setting a precedent for the admission of new States to the Union, insofar as this Territory is concerned, that precedent has been established almost 46 years ago, coming April, when we admitted the Territory as a Territory in the Union?

Mr. WRENN. Indeed I do.

Representative ANGELL. With respect to outlying islands in the Pacific that might in the dim future present themselves as candidates for admission to the Union, they would stand on their own footing at that time, as you have discussed it?

Mr. WRENN. That's the way I feel about it.

Representative ANGELL. We would not be establishing any dangerous precedent in admitting this Territory to the Union at this time.

Mr. WRENN. I can't see it at all.

Representative ANGELL. As a matter of fact, there are only two Territories in our possession, Alaska and Hawaii, and for each of them we have passed upon the problem as to whether ultimately they might be admitted to statehood.

Chairman DELANEY. Thank you, Mr. Wrenn. The Chair recognizes Judge Robertson.

Mr. ROBERTSON. We present Dr. Gregg M. Sinclair, president of the University of Hawaii.

(Mr. Wrenn withdraws, and Mr. Sinclair takes the witness chair.)

Mr. SINCLAIR. My name is Gregg Sinclair. I am the president of the University of Hawaii. I went to school in Minnesota and Columbia. I have been out here since 1928 as a teacher of English in the University of Hawaii, and in 1935 I was made the director of the Oriental Institute, an organization that centered on two things, one, the training of teachers for, with a knowledge of Asiatic subjects—Japan, China and India—for mainland colleges particularly; and second, to translate the cultures of these Asiatic countries to the peoples of the West. Because of that position I was compelled to travel in Asia quite extensively—1936, '37, '38, and '39. I haven't been there since 1939. I was made president of the University of Hawaii in 1942, July 1.

I have prepared a little statement, not very long. It's in two parts. The statement that Dean Wist prepared for you is called Public Education in Hawaii and Statehood, but that is simply submitted to you (Statement No. 12). My statement is on the university, and secondly, on my belief that statehood should be given to Hawaii in 1946, at least in time for us to vote for President in 1948.

The University of Hawaii was founded in 1907, as the College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts. The university grew out of it in 1920. I think the significance of the University of Hawaii, so far as statehood is concerned, lies in the fact that this Territory on its own account created an institution that compares favorably with mainland universities. The university is a land-grant college, just as are the Universities of California, Cornell, Louisiana State University, and Oregon State College. These are all land-grant universities. As with them, so with us, agriculture is important.

Now the University of Hawaii is an accredited institution, too. I mean by that, our students may transfer from this university to Cornell or California without loss of credits. I think some figures on the size of the university and so on have been given you. It's now perhaps necessary to say that we have a budget, an annual budget, of \$2,000,000, over \$2,000,000, and that about 17 percent of that comes from Federal sources. [See exhibit No. 12 h.]

Now, we have four colleges, one, Arts and Sciences; one, Applied Science; one, Teachers College; one, Agricultural College. Now

some people in this Territory have questioned whether the Territory can support the kind of university we feel we should have here in this strategic place. But I have always pointed out that we are not going to duplicate the facilities of other universities that have been in existence longer and have established their places, their colleges. But we are going to concentrate our efforts on what we can do right here in this situation. I mean by that we are not going to have a medical college, or a dental college or a law college. We think that our students can gain elsewhere perhaps to better advantage in those fields. In the graduate field we want to devote ourselves to those things we think we can do best. One is tropical agriculture. The adaptation of mainland vegetables to the local market, too, and the second is specific in Asiatic studies.

I remember that I discussed this question about 2 years ago with Nicholas Murray Butler who, at least on this question, was fairly sensible. He said that it wasn't necessary for the University of Hawaii to buy all the books on Shakespeare and Milton that there are in existence, but our students might do better graduate work at Cornell or Yale or Harvard. But our students at Columbia, he said, aren't interested in tropical agriculture or in Pacific or Asiatic studies, so you concentrate on those things you can do well, and we will concentrate on those things we think we can do well. I thought that was a very agreeable point.

Now the legislature last year asked the University of Hawaii to establish a school of public administration. We hope to do this. We have been under wraps more or less so far, because of the war, but we think that's a necessary thing. Perhaps as a corollary to that we may have a school of colonial administration, because we feel a certain responsibility for the islands of the South Seas, too. If we do have a school of public administration we hope to center it around the Legislative Reference Bureau, which was created by act of the legislature in 1943 as a department of the university.

Now in research, our main interests at the university are agriculture, race relations, and fisheries. I think these have been mentioned to you heretofore. I think Dr. Lind appeared before you in race relations. The University of Hawaii has perhaps more information on miscegenation than any place in the world. I think Colin Lennox explained to you how the school and the board of agriculture and forestry were attempting to carry on a fishery project of some consequence to the people of Hawaii, and of some consequence to the people of the country. We are hampered, however, by the fact that the bill introduced by Mr. Farrington has not been passed, that would provide Federal support for this great work.

Now the second part of my statement concerns statehood for Hawaii more directly. I have gone into the arguments of those opposed to statehood, and as I did so I have been impressed by this fact: Hawaii as one of the sovereign States will be in a much better position to solve every one of these problems better than Hawaii as a Territory, plus the Congress, plus the Organic Act. Basically, I think there have been, and are, two arguments opposed to statehood. And I think they should be met and solved. And they are both mentioned in the 1937 report on statehood. That report called attention to the fact that the addition of Hawaii as a State presents a departure, as it would be the first noncontiguous area to be admitted. Well, we have to admit that

we are still noncontiguous. But is this argument so important now as it was in 1937, or as it has been before? If we were asking for statehood in 1900 I think it would be a very pertinent argument, but I don't see that it is today. I think it goes back in history to the time when perhaps it was necessary to move troops from one State to another say, in the Whisky Rebellion of 1794, or perhaps in the Civil War time when it was necessary to move troops from one place to another. But surely America has become an air-minded country and a navy-minded country, in the last 10 years particularly. And I think by any other test than walking or riding a horse, Hawaii is closer to the Capital of the country than was any State admitted to the Union after the first 13.

I talked this over with President Conant of Harvard. He immediately picked it up and he said, "Yes, let's see; Vermont was the fourteenth State, wasn't it?" I thought it was Vermont, but I hadn't checked it up, but I think now it is Vermont. He said, "Yes, I remember; it took about 4 days for a person to travel from Vermont to New York, the Capital at that time. How long does it take to get to Hawaii or to come from Hawaii?" I said, "Today, with good plane connections, as they had good stage coaches in the days when Vermont was admitted, it might take a day to get to the Capital, probably 27 hours, if you are slow—it could." But the fact is that we are in every way connected with the country. We heard the fireside chats, and I tell you very frankly, we felt as close to President Roosevelt as the people in the District of Columbia must have felt.

You know our newspapers. We get the services. We get all services. And it seems to me, therefore, that that argument is not so pertinent as it once was.

Well, the second point is the racial situation, and in spite of everything, I feel that most people are more concerned with this than they are with anything else. And if statehood is not granted to us it is a continuation of the belief that Hawaii is not ready for it racially. That was mentioned, however, in the 1937 report. At that time the 1937 report made this point:

Whatever the racial complexion of Hawaii may have been was in fact already existent at the time of the annexation, and can hardly now be raised against its people.

Now, as a matter of fact, we are very proud; we don't apologize for our people here. We are very proud of our people here. We think we have a much richer life in the Territory of Hawaii because we do have some people of so many racial descents. It's a very colorful experience to live in Hawaii. I might say that I was asked once to have a day at the university in which all students would dress up in the costume of their racial ancestry. And I felt that that would be an excellent thing to do, until I remembered that I would have to appear in kilts, and I refused to accept the suggestion. But on all other counts it would have been a very glorious experience for us to have had such a thing. Life is richer here.

Now the question comes, are these people properly Americanized? Well, you have heard all the arguments pro and con. My own testimony is, I feel very proud of these people as American citizens.

Now I feel that Hawaii should be granted statehood now, because of all the arguments that are made, but also because of the fact that

in my travels in the Orient I found one thing: I found that American prestige in Asia was immense in 1936 and '38 when I traveled there. And it was immense for one reason, and that is our treatment of the Filipinos. We promised them independence. We carried through. It was an instance of democratic people, democratic procedure for government of a dependent people. Now with the world organization such as it is, with the UNO, it seems to me we have to get along with the peoples of the world, and it seems to me that there is no place in the world where this has been demonstrated so well and in no place in the world would there be better people qualified to make a sincere contribution at this time to the government of the world than Hawaii can make.

Now this goes back to one other thing: why a State as in the State of Hawaii projects American democratic procedure 2,000 miles into an area where in the future our diplomacy is going must be much more intelligent than it has ever been before. Europe is pretty well exhausted, from the standpoint of knowledge, of peoples, from the standpoint of procedures, all the way through the centuries. The situation in Asia is quite different. Asia has more people than has any other continent, over half the people of the world. Necessarily we are going to have very much more dealings with Asia than ever before.

I think the point that Mr. Miller brought out, or Mr. Angell, I'm not quite sure which, the two Senators from Hawaii would make a very sincere and great contribution to American government at this time is one that we should stress. We are not asking for State government solely because we want to vote for President in 1948, although I confess I do, I hope I'll be able to do so. We are asking for it because we honestly feel that the experiment in Hawaii, the experiment of democracy in Hawaii, is an experiment that is of value to the whole people of the country. And I think that when you find out, when the mainland finds out what has been done here in the war years by the civilian population, as well as by the military, I think they will be very happy, indeed, that Hawaii is an integral part of the country. Thank you.

Chairman DELANEY. Mr. Farrington.

Delegate FARRINGTON. Mr. Sinclair, by way of illustrating the contribution that can be made by this Territory to the country in various fields of activity, and particularly yourself, I wonder if you would tell the committee something of the different individuals on your faculty who have been drawn into the service of our country, both as officers and civilians, because of their special knowledge of Pacific conditions?

Mr. SINCLAIR. Yes. Colonel Coulter, the geographer, has been in Washington from the beginning of the war. His job was to get the final map, as I understand it, and the facts regarding the islands of the Pacific. Dr. Keesing, anthropology, was also in Washington. Dr. Bowles was also in Washington, also in anthropology. He was in Washington for the same purpose. He is now connected with the State Department and is, I believe, in charge of the cultural program so far as Japan is concerned. There have been quite a number of others of that same general character. [See Statement No. 30.]

Chairman DELANEY. Mr. Taylor.

Representative TAYLOR. I just wanted to ask you, Doctor, do most of the teachers who teach in the elementary schools here in the Territory get their diplomas from the University of Hawaii?

Mr. SINCLAIR. I think Mr. Long will be in a better position to answer that a little later, but I can say this: The Teachers' College at the university is designed to prepare teachers for the public schools of the Territory, and that is our main job. However, we have been turning out only, well, I have forgotten the exact number, approximately 100 each year, which isn't enough. Therefore, I think teachers have to be brought in from the mainland.

Representative TAYLOR. Is there any such thing as a transfer plan of teachers from Hawaii to the mainland, anything of that nature?

Mr. SINCLAIR. Well, yes. Mr. Long, I think, can answer that quite extensively. We are at the present time working for an exchange of students with the mainland. We think that our students in the formative years, perhaps in the second or third year, might very profitably go to other places and get a broader point of view, and then come back and take their professional work here.

As you know, English is a problem with us, and we are attempting to handle it. We are quite proud, in fact, of what we are trying to do with English in the schools of the Territory. But it's a very difficult problem, very hard problem. But we are on that.

On the matter of exchanges, I am wholly sold on it. I believe our people would be better if they had the mainland experience, and I believe the mainlanders would be better for an experience in Hawaii.

Representative ANGELL. President Sinclair, I believe you stated you were a student at Columbia in New York?

Mr. SINCLAIR. That's right.

Representative ANGELL. Were you a student at the Teachers College?

Mr. SINCLAIR. No.

Representative ANGELL. What branch?

Mr. SINCLAIR. Sociology.

Representative ANGELL. Have you had teaching experience in the mainland?

Mr. SINCLAIR. No.

Representative ANGELL. Your teaching has been here?

Mr. SINCLAIR. Yes. I taught in Japan five years.

Representative ANGELL. You are quite familiar with educational developments in the mainland, I presume?

Mr. SINCLAIR. Yes.

Representative ANGELL. What, in your judgment, doctor, is the culture here from an educational standpoint as compared with that in the States of the Union?

Mr. SINCLAIR. By culture, you mean——

Representative ANGELL. I mean general educational development of the citizenry of the Territory through your educational system.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Well, I can say this: That in summer we bring down a great many distinguished people. We try to bring down great professors, and many of them have told me that they teach the courses here exactly as they teach them in the mainland universities. We are not behind them in the cultural proceedings. As

a matter of fact, we had a culture test at the university for the freshmen a year ago, and I believe that it showed that we were 1 month behind the mainland in these various tests, which was quite remarkable, as a matter of fact. And I think our teachers' college group was ahead of the mainland norm. It wasn't exactly fair, however, because we didn't have so many men take the test as we did women, and men make the better results on this particular test than the women do, perhaps because mathematics and things of that kind were stressed in that.

Representative ANGELL. In your opinion, how is the general level of education here in the Territory of your students as a whole in the primary schools and on through compare with those on the mainland?

Mr. SINCLAIR. Well, I think they compare very favorably. We have to understand, however, that many of the students in the university are first-generation college students. Many of the students are unfamiliar with those things which we associate with, which we absorb from our parents. When a student asked me, for instance, when I was teaching "Paradise Lost," this question, I was slightly embarrassed. He said, "What is Adam's first name? If I knew that, maybe I would remember him." You know, it never occurred to me that Adam had a first name, you see. Their information goes in other directions from what our culture proceeded.

Representative ANGELL. Numerically, do as many of the children of school age attend school here as in the mainland?

Mr. SINCLAIR. Well, I can't say. I think about 20 percent. On the public schools?

Representative ANGELL. All the schools here.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I think Mr. Long can perhaps answer that better than I can. We have about 20 percent of the senior class. The graduates come to the university. They are very severely screened, however. There is no racial discrimination, but if they don't meet the aptitude tests, and if they are not recommended by their high school tests, and there are three other tests, we don't allow them to come into the university. We don't think that that is advisable.

Representative ANGELL. All the schools are conducted in the English language?

Mr. SINCLAIR. Yes, sir.

Representative ANGELL. There are no foreign language schools?

Mr. SINCLAIR. No, no more.

Representative ANGELL. In your opinion, are the people here from an educational standpoint qualified for the exercise of citizenship as a State of the Union?

Mr. SINCLAIR. I believe it absolutely.

Representative MILLER. Doctor, I take it that you subscribe to the theme I have harped on here from time to time that perhaps the future of the United States lies in the Pacific basin as away from the Atlantic seaboard?

Mr. SINCLAIR. I do.

Representative MILLER. And that Hawaii's position puts us in a very strategic, or is a very strategic one for this country in the development economically, socially, and politically within that sphere?

Mr. SINCLAIR. Yes, I subscribe to that wholeheartedly.

Representative LARCADE. Doctor, due to the fact that sugar is the principal industry of the Territory and that Louisiana is one of the largest sugar producing States in the United States, have you taken advantage of the student exchange program with Louisiana State University, which has a special department in that respect?

Mr. SINCLAIR. We have taken advantage to this extent: That, although the University of Hawaii is in a sugar-producing country, a good many of our students go to Louisiana to take their education. I wish it were not quite so prominent.

Representative LARCADE. I thought that was true. That's why I wanted to bring that fact out.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Yes; Louisiana has a wonderful school, and we are patterning now a program for a fifth year on Louisiana State's program.

Representative LARCADE. Fine. Mr. Chairman, may I ask unanimous consent that at this point Dr. Sinclair be permitted to submit for the record, and that it be included therein, this statement by Dr. Benjamin O. Wist, dean of the Teachers College of the University of Hawaii, as well as any other statement he might desire to file?

Chairman DELANEY. Without objection.

(The document was received and marked "Statement No. 12.")

Delegate FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, there is one question I would ask by way of supplementing my earlier question, and that is, is it not true that the development of the Pacific, that the development of the agricultural resources of the Pacific islands that was carried on during the period of the war for purposes of supplying our troops and our sailors with fresh vegetables and the like was carried on under the direction of men who were selected from the extension service of the University of Hawaii?

Mr. SINCLAIR. Yes; that whole group, I did not mention, I should have. The director of the extension service, Mr. Harry Warner, was the deputy man in charge of the FEA work in the whole Pacific. Mr. Ashley Brown went down to Guadalcanal and was sponsor, was responsible, for that 2,700-acre farm down there that supplied fresh vegetables to the troops. He also went later to Guam. Mr. Gant went to Guam, also of the extension service—went to Guam to establish the dairy out there.

It comes as a surprise to some people on the mainland to know that cows cannot be imported into the tropics and survive. There have to be certain adjustments made. We feel our people in the experiment and service station are perhaps better qualified to make those adjustments than people coming from Minnesota or Wisconsin or such places as that. We have three other people who are, who have been connected with that work in the Pacific.

Representative TAYLOR. Does your extension service get any Federal aid at all?

Mr. SINCLAIR. Yes; quite. We get all the Federal aid I think that we would get otherwise. Our great difficulty is not in getting all the funds. Mr. Farrington was able to persuade the Congress to advance our funds in the experiment station from \$67,500, which we received for many years when we were only in the status of a Territory, but with his advent down there we were able to get \$90,000—

that's for the experiment station. I think we got about \$150,000 for the extension service.

Chairman DELANEY. Doctor, in summarizing your remarks, you stated that the admission of this Territory could be an experiment for the whole world to look at. The admission itself is a more positive move, is that right?

Mr. SINCLAIR. Yes, I don't like the word "experiment," but I suppose I'll have to pass it, the idea.

Chairman DELANEY. Well, I am taking your words. I believe that you used the word "experiment." It's more than an experiment, is it not?

Mr. SINCLAIR. Yes, it is.

Chairman DELANEY. It is a positive step, once taken it cannot be retracted?

Mr. SINCLAIR. That's right.

Chairman DELANEY. I don't say that anyone would want to retract, but just to clear up that situation.

Mr. SINCLAIR. No, I am sorry if I used the word "experiment." I didn't mean that. It's a positive step, and a good one.

Chairman DELANEY. All right, doctor. Five minute recess.

(A recess was taken at this point. The meeting reconvened at 11:17 o'clock, a. m.)

Chairman DELANEY. The committee will be in order. The Chair recognizes Judge Robertson.

Mr. ROBERTSON. We present Mr. Oren E. Long, superintendent of public instruction.

Chairman DELANEY. Won't you have a seat, Mr. Long?

Mr. LONG. Thank you. My name is Oren E. Long. I was born 56 years ago in the State of Kansas. I was educated in the public schools of that State, and the academy in Tennessee, the University of Tennessee, Michigan and Columbia Universities, having degrees from the last two institutions. I came to Hawaii 29 years ago. I have been rather closely associated with the human side of Hawaii, as a settlement worker, personnel director on a plantation, high school classroom teacher, high school principal, deputy superintendent for 9 years, and superintendent for 12 years.

I appeared before the 1935 and the 1937 statehood committees. At that time I raised two questions, first, have the people of Hawaii the general intelligence and the ability to meet the problems that would confront them under statehood? and secondly, have they the understanding of American institutions and sole loyalty that we would expect of the citizens of any State in the Union? I gave at that time an answer in the affirmative. I believed that Hawaii was qualified at that time. I did not stress the thought that statehood should be granted immediately; as I go through the records, I find that. I wish now to express the same confidence in the capacity of Hawaii for self-government, and to state that I believe thoroughly that the time is now, that it should not be postponed any longer.

I have prepared a statement, which has been distributed. I wish to refer very briefly to certain parts of that statement [statement No. 13] [reading:]

The United States depends primarily upon one organized instrument to develop an intelligent and informed citizenry. This instrument is the public school.

Support of the public schools in Hawaii has been based on a conviction that the chief function of tax-supported education is to produce good citizens. This means the ability to earn a living, to supply the needs to one's self and of dependents, to be a good home builder and a good neighbor, to cooperate with others in carrying on the work of all organized agencies, including the various functions of government.

Now in Hawaii there are evidences that as a result of all the influences that play upon the growing child, including education, that progress has been made. I wish to refer to some of the reasons why I think Hawaii has something to offer to the Union, and why Hawaii is now prepared to offer that.

In the first place, I want to refer to the organization of public schools in Hawaii. It's unique. We have for the entire Territory, the seven inhabited islands, only one school board, made up of eight members. We have no local school board in the sense that New York and Oregon and Louisiana and other States have local school boards. There is a weakness there, perhaps, in that it might result, I think it inevitably does result, in removing the control of education slightly from the patrons of the school. But that's only a slight shortcoming. The great advantage is, and this is the second thing I wish to mention, the great advantage is that it has enabled Hawaii to attain in actual practice one of the first considerations of a democracy. And that is, equality of educational opportunity for all of the children of the State or of the entire community. Now, that's a very important thing.

You recently toured the big island. You drove through the Kona country of the big island. You observed that that, as compared with communities on Oahu, there is very little wealth. And yet our schools in their program, in their organization, in the certification requirements of teachers, in the salaries that are paid to those teachers, in educational supply and equipment items, in all of those things those less favored communities are provided with schools exactly comparable to the schools that are provided for the boys and girls here in the city. And I submit that that is a very important consideration in relation to the ability of a population to conduct its own affairs. And I might add also that those of us who are engaged in educational work trust that when we move from the Territorial status to that of statehood, that this centralized feature of our school set-up will be maintained, improved, we hope, but nevertheless we want that feature, at least everything in it that pertains to providing equality of educational opportunity retained. Furthermore, it is interesting to note in passing that the trend on the mainland is away from the small unit toward the larger unit, which Hawaii has had for generations. Good examples of that are the State of Delaware, the State of North Carolina, California, in its financing, has moved a long way toward bringing about this equality of educational opportunity.

In the brief prepared I have referred to the financial support of education in Hawaii. A recent bulletin of the Office of Education, No. 231, issued in 1945, shows that so far as the annual salaries paid teachers is concerned, Hawaii rates very high. As a matter of fact, at that time there were only four States and the District of Columbia that paid a higher, five states and the District of Columbia, that pay, each of them, a higher annual salary than Hawaii. Those states are New York, New Jersey, Connecticut, Massachusetts, California, and the District of Columbia.

It's interesting to note that the average for all urban schools, according to this report, in the United States was \$2,013 annually. That's for the year 1941-42, \$2,013. For United States country schools, or rural schools, \$1,018. For Hawaii, over-all, \$2,014, or just \$1 higher in the average annual salary than the city systems of the United States. It gives us a very enviable standing in that respect. Last year our annual expenditure, per child, for the school year, closing June 30, was \$114.71, which puts us in the higher brackets.

One other topic that I wish to mention, that I think is of primary importance at this time, is the fact that right from the beginning of the history of our Territorial government here we have had as a first objective, a conscious objective, in our public-school program, is the development of citizenship, from the time that the child enters the lower grade to the time that he leaves at the end of the high-school grade. I think we have have gone a long way.

I wish to mention only one statement made by Dr. Edgar M. Draper, professor of curriculum at the University of Washington, who was sent out here about a year ago by the American Council on Education to make a study. The opening paragraph of his report reads as follows, and it's very brief:

The Territory of Hawaii had convincing evidence in the days which followed December 7, 1941, that its educational program had faced a critical test, and that the objectives and ideals of democratic citizenship had become a part of the lives of a people of many races and backgrounds. Every American citizen owes a debt of gratitude to those people in the Territory who had the vision to plan and to develop a democratic school program. Few other communities can boast of having done so much educationally in such a short period of time.

Rather an extravagant statement, and perhaps one that those of us who worked closely with it would hesitate to make. I submit it, and others are submitted in the brief, indicating that there are evidences of progress. I think, Mr. Chairman, that the other part of my brief should be submitted without comment, due to the shortness of time. I might add that our school services are very similar to the school services in the best school systems of the United States. Our program in the field of dental hygiene has been referred to repeatedly as the best in America, outside of very small localities. Representatives from the United States Office of Education on different occasions have commended Hawaii for the effectiveness of its program of nutrition, the cafeteria service. Dr. Larsen, when he appeared before the group, spoke favorably of the health work that's being done, more particularly health education rather than health service, on the part of the school board. We have hearing testing, vision testing; the features that are found in most of the outstanding school systems are to a greater or lesser extent found here in Hawaii.

So far as progress is concerned, we have established within the last dozen years a single salary schedule, also a very active exchange teacher program. We have sent 300 of our teachers to mainland communities, and have received a similar number in exchange. That was between the years 1934 and 1941, at the outbreak of the war. We have sabbatical leave for our teachers. They are insular, many of them. It's of great importance that they get away. We have a compulsory attendance law that compares somewhat favorably, to 16½ years. We have kindergartens, we have guidance, adult education. In the last

12 years we have opened 16 new senior high schools, 12 of them in rural communities, so that the boys and girls of rural Hawaii will not have to leave home or travel long distances to take advantage of secondary education. I think that is on the positive side of the presentation that I wish to make. It's covered more fully in the paper, and the exhibits.

Chairman DELANEY. Without objection, I move to make Mr. Long's brief a part of the record. So ordered.

(The document was received, and marked "Statement No. 13" and "Exhibits 62 A, B, C, D.")

Chairman DELANEY. Any questions?

Delegate FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, at last I would like to ask the witness to state briefly what the benefits are that will come to education in Hawaii from statehood.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, we are already participating in all Federal financial support, that is the Smith-Hughes program, rehabilitation, more recently day care. That was on a temporary basis. Funds for sight conservation, work for the blind, so there would be no great gain from that standpoint. But there is another side of society that is even more important than that. If our purpose has been, as I have stated, primarily to produce good citizens, that means that in our history classes and our social science classes we must captivate the interest of the child, find situations that appeal to him. Anyone who is on the outside of a game, looking at it, cannot have the interest, the driving interest that he has when he is a part of it. And from the standpoint of practicing democracy, even though it may gain on the street, among neighbors and civic organizations, and be practiced in the school, the fact remains that the climax of it, the very apex of it is the national scene. Now, if Hawaii were represented in the United States Senate by two Members, and in the House of Representatives by the number to which it will be entitled as the years go by, when great issues are up, when Congress is voting, we'll say, on the lend-lease bill, or to establish selective military service, it would be an entirely different reaction on the part of not only the children, but I am talking about the children, on the part of everyone in Hawaii, if we could check the record and see how our Senators voted, whether they divided, and if they did divide, the youngsters would be interested in studying it. I could use a comparison there.

On New Year's Day, just about everyone in Hawaii sat for a couple of hours with his ears glued to the radio, because there was being played in New Orleans what proved to be a great football game, and every youngster here played vicariously with Wedemeyer and Spike Cordeiro and Henry Van Gieson. It meant something to them. Now, is it unreasonable to assume that, from the standpoint of participation in national affairs, that the action of Congress or of the executive department or the judiciary, would mean more if we were actually a part of it all the way through? I think that is one of the great gains that would come to education in Hawaii. It would be a part of our general socialization.

Delegate FARRINGTON. I'd like to ask Mr. Long this question: I note that in your statement you make no reference to the Japanese-language schools, which have constituted something of a problem in the past.

In as few words as possible will you state to the committee the present status of those schools and their prospects?

Mr. LONG. By legislative action in 1943, I think it was Act 104, the teaching of any modern language is prohibited in the schools of the Territory, public schools, private schools, all schools, unless the child to be enrolled has attained fourth-year rating, that is, the completion of the fourth year, ready for the fifth year, on standardized tests, with special emphasis on English tests, or the child must have completed eighth grade without such tests. Or, third, he must have attained his fifteenth birthday. No reference to oriental languages, simply modern languages. There is a second important clause to that act, namely, that before anyone can teach a modern language in public or private schools of Hawaii that teacher must be certified, and the certification is to be based primarily upon mastery of English, particularly the English idiom, and in the second place reasonable mastery of the foreign language that is to be taught. In other words, we think that legally the oriental language schools are out of the picture. There is another reason. From the standpoint of public opinion in Hawaii, we believe that they are out, as such. Now there is a strong feeling that just as the high schools, junior high schools and senior high schools of America offer French and German and Spanish, the schools of the southwest, particularly, offer the Spanish language, that we should provide an offering in Chinese and Korean and Japanese for those children who can qualify under the law and who are proficient in speech. I think undoubtedly that the school board in Hawaii will ultimately do that.

Delegate FARRINGTON. In other words, the Japanese language school, as we have known it in the past, is gone, in your opinion?

Mr. LONG. It's gone, undoubtedly, yes.

Representative TAYLOR. Doctor, in line with what you have just been discussing, there has been some reference made by one of the witnesses, and I think his statement has become a part of the record, to the DPI. I assume that means the department of public instruction?

Mr. LONG. The department of public instruction.

Representative TAYLOR. And as the superintendent of public instruction I assume that the DPI comes directly under your supervision?

Mr. LONG. It does; yes.

Representative TAYLOR. And to specifically refer to what I believe to be a serious indictment of DPI [see statement No. 8], I'll quote you what our record now contains with respect to the question of teaching Americanism. The record will indicate that a statement has been included in our record which says that the DPI has failed to see to it that Americanism has been given top priority over foreign culture, allegiance, and inculcation. And if you would care to, doctor, I'd like to give you the opportunity to refute that statement.

Mr. LONG. Citizenship, loyalty, of course involve information, reasonable background of information, and particularly that intangible something that we call loyalty or sole loyalty. It's psychological. That is the basis in the emotions, it has its basis in the emotions more than it does in the cold intellect. Therefore, it's exceedingly difficult to argue with anyone who makes a statement of that kind. I do wish to make this, or these statements first.

Those of us who have worked closely with these young people in the public schools, in the private schools, in the organized social agen-

cies, believe in them, and we find many evidences of their understanding of American institutions, and evidences of loyalty to those institutions. We find little or nothing in our contact with them in the classroom and on the playground and in the social halls that even points remotely to a devotion to another country as such. That's statement No. 1.

Statement No. 2, In World War II, through which we have just gone, almost every record that has come out of Hawaii has had the commendation of military authorities. I have attached as one of the exhibits a statement by General Emmons, made in January, February, of 1942, in which an extreme statement is made about the behavior of the people of Hawaii. He's not talking about the One Hundredth Infantry and the Four Hundred and Forty-Second on the battle front. He's talking about the people here in Hawaii, the old timers, the younger people. Those statements could be multiplied—the lack of anything in the record that shows overt acts, sabotage and things like that. [See exhibit 62 B.]. It's a little difficult to argue that point. It's comparable, because it's emotional, to argue whether or not a husband loves his wife, or the mother has due love, due regard, for the child. The only evidence you have is in conduct, and in relation to conduct our young people and our older residents here have a splendid record. I read this statement from Dr. Draper. It was his first visit to the islands. He was selected by the American Council on Education, one of the four learned societies. He came here, spent his time entirely in the schools, and opened his report with that rather strong statement that I read.

Representative LARCADE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a question of the witness. Dr. Long, I'd like to ask a question on account of your position. I think you are in a better position to answer that question than nearly anyone else I know in the Territory. At one of our meetings on one of the islands one of the opponents to statehood made the statement, and a challenge, that in his opinion at the time of the plebiscite in 1940 that the people of Hawaii who participated in that plebiscite did not understand the question, and it was his opinion that they were not qualified to pass on the question at that time. Would you be able to give me your opinion in that respect?

Mr. LONG. He's much less complimentary to the people of Hawaii than I would be. As I look back upon the wide publicity that was given to that through the press, over the radio, in a little pamphlet that was put out by a committee of 15, of which the present Delegate to Congress was a member, when that committee and others flooded this Territory with information, I think it was a very intelligent vote. That's my opinion.

Representative LARCADE. I'd just like to make one observation with respect to the statement you made with regard to these three fine boys who participated in the Sugar Bowl game in my State on New Year's Day. I happened to be present for the first half, and while I was not able to remain for the entire game because I had to leave in order to join the committee in New York for this visit, I want to say that these boys played spectacular football and gave to us down there a new brand of football that we had never seen before. And while they lost the game they won the hearts of the people of the South.

Mr. LONG. They got that at Roosevelt Public High School and St. Louis Private School here.

Representative MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I hadn't anticipated participating in this discussion, but as long as the chairman led off, as an alumnus of St. Mary's College I say thank you for the compliment.

Mr. LONG. I think, Mr. Chairman, that 331 mainland teachers that we brought in in the last 2 years, that statement should go in the record, that we brought from the mainland to supplement this local group that President Sinclair talked about.

Chairman DELANEY. The Chair recognizes Judge Robertson.

Mr. ROBERTSON. We present Mr. John Wilson, director of public welfare.

(Mr. Long withdraws and Mr. Wilson takes the witness chair.)

Chairman DELANEY. Mr. Wilson, in view of the time, we are running far behind, will you confine your record and make it as brief as possible?

Mr. WILSON. I think we can. My name is John H. Wilson, born in Honolulu 74 years ago. The first 25 years of my life I practiced engineering and contracting, educated in engineering, public schools of Honolulu and Stanford University. The last 20 years of my life, public life, I have spent as city engineer, mayor of Honolulu, postmaster of Honolulu, now director of public welfare.

Chairman DELANEY. Have you prepared a statement?

Mr. WILSON. Yes, sir.

Chairman DELANEY. Do you wish to submit that?

Mr. WILSON. Yes.

Chairman DELANEY. Without objection, so ordered, a part of the record.

(The document was received, and marked "Statement No. 14," and "Exhibits 63 A and B.")

Chairman DELANEY. Have you any comment to make on your statement, the highlights?

Mr. WILSON. I think the statement covers everything. I would say we have a very progressive program here in Hawaii. We have in effect in Hawaii many laws that other States contemplate. For instance, Congress still has before it your medical-care program, by Senator Wagner. We have that practically in effect in Hawaii. And I can state briefly the act went into effect in Hawaii July 1, 1943. We have treated over 43,000 patients in that period, and I have yet to receive one complaint. I think all the highlights are covered in my statement.

Chairman DELANEY. No questions? [No response.] The Chair recognizes the judge.

Mr. WILSON. One more point. The equal rights commission asked the Social Security Board to make a statement, and I wish to present here as exhibit C part of my statement, a statement from Mr. Powell, executive director of the Social Security Board.

Chairman DELANEY. You wish to make that part of the record?

Mr. WILSON. Part of the record, which effectively corroborates my statement.

Chairman DELANEY. So ordered.

(The document was received, and marked "Exhibit No. 63C.")

Delegate FARRINGTON. In your capacity as a public official, and as national committeeman for the Democratic National Party for many years, you have consistently supported statehood for Hawaii?

Mr. WILSON. Yes, sir.

Delegate FARRINGTON. And you favor immediate statehood for Hawaii now?

Mr. WILSON. Yes, sir. In fact, I think there has been one point overlooked by everyone. Had we had in the early fifties the transportation that we have today, Hawaii probably would have been a State way back in the early fifties under President Pierce.

(Mr. Wilson withdraws, and Attorney General C. Nils Tavares takes the witness chair.)

Mr. TAVARES. Mr. Chairman, I desire to present a statement on law enforcement in the Territory of Hawaii, including, among other things, data and graphs showing crime trends, and showing that, in my opinion, the Territory is in a very healthy situation from the crime standpoint. Just one more statement, I'd like to state—

Representative ANGELL. Does that cover child delinquency?

Mr. TAVARES. Not particularly. It includes all statistics on crime.

Representative ANGELL. Will there be evidence submitted with respect to that problem?

Mr. TAVARES. We do not have it available at present, but I could get it in a very short time.

Representative ANGELL. I would like that to be submitted.

Chairman DELANEY. Would you get it and have it made part of the record? [See exhibits Nos. 85, 86, 87, 88, 89.]

Mr. TAVARES. Yes, sir; a letter from Colonel Fielder, then head of military intelligence in Hawaii, in which he stated that there has been no known acts of sabotage, espionage, or fifth-column activities committed by the Japanese in Hawaii, either on or subsequent to December 7, 1941. In October of this year I talked to the now General Fielder and he stated that that statement was true as of that date.

(The document on law enforcement, with accompanying graphs and exhibits, was received and marked "Statement No. 15," and "Exhibits No. 64 A to L.")

Chairman DELANEY. The Chair recognizes Judge Robertson.

Mr. ROBERTSON. We present Col. Farrant L. Turner.

(Mr. Tavares withdraws, and Colonel Turner takes the witness chair.)

Colonel TURNER. I was born in Hilo, Hawaii, in 1895. I am 50 years old, educated in the public schools of Hilo and at Punahou Academy here in Honolulu, graduated from Wesleyan University in Middletown, Conn., in 1917. I am a veteran of World War I and World War II. I have spent 6 years in Federal service as an officer in the United States Army, and 16 years in the National Guard of the Territory of Hawaii. This has been my home all my life, with the exception of time spent away in the military service or at college on the mainland.

When war broke out I was in active service with the Two Hundred and Ninety-eighth Infantry as executive officer on duty at Schofield Barracks. During the year after we went into service, which was October 15, 1940, we and the Two Hundred and Ninety-ninth Infantry received through the induction system about 1,400 men of Japanese

ancestry. These men, of course, after December 7, 1941, became a problem to the military. They didn't know how they were going to act. Finally, in May of 1942, approximately 6 months after the war broke out, it was decided to send the Japanese-Americans of Japanese ancestry then in the military service to the mainland to form a combat unit for service on another front. I applied for the command of that unit, and was given it. I took 1,406 men from Hawaii to Wisconsin on June 5 of 1942, leaving here while the battle of Midway was going on. We trained in Wisconsin, and later in Mississippi, Camp Shelby, and left for overseas, I believe, on August 11 of—August 21 of 1943. The One Hundredth Battalion went into action on September 29 of 1943, and remained in action until May of 1945, almost two solid years of combat.

In January, I believe it was, of 1943, some 7 months or so after the One Hundredth Infantry Battalion which I commanded was activated, the authorities decided to form the Four Hundred and Forty-second Combat Team. This was also composed entirely of Americans of Japanese ancestry, and a call for volunteers from here netted nine-thousand-eight-hundred-odd volunteers. From these they selected some two-thousand-six-hundred-odd men, who were sent to Mississippi, where they joined other Japanese, others of Japanese ancestry at Camp Shelby. They formed the Four Hundred and Forty-second Combat Team, consisting of one regiment of infantry, a battalion of field artillery and a company of engineers. That combat team was trained in Mississippi and in Louisiana in the maneuvers down there, and was sent overseas, I believe in June or May of 1944. They went into action in June of that same year, and remained continuously in action until the end of the war, in May of last year. They were all a part of the Fifth Army, and for a great part of the time they were in action in Italy with a part of the Thirty-fourth Division, which was composed originally of National Guard troops from the two Dakotas and from Minnesota and from Iowa. They were commanded by General Reilert, sometimes known as Charles W. Reilert, a grand officer and a very, very fine friend of the Americans of Japanese ancestry, once he saw them fight.

I might augment a little of my two predecessors', three predecessors' statements on education. The One Hundredth Battalion, and the survey that I made, showed that they had had 3 years of high school. This was an average for the entire battalion, 1,400 men, 3 years of high school. They had an average I. Q. of 103. That 103 compared with what was required to send a man to officers' candidate school of 110, and I believe proves that the One Hundredth Battalion, and I believe the same figures would apply to the Four Hundred and Forty-second Infantry, had as high an I. Q. as any infantry outfit in the United States Army. I believe—I haven't the figures to prove this—but I am making the statement as to my belief, I believe that no higher I. Q. was held by any unit other than some technical unit, such as a radar unit or possibly an engineering unit, or maybe a medical unit, where the men were largely of college status. The men distinguished themselves in battle. There is no question about that. They were loyal to a degree.

Of the One Hundredth Battalion, of 1,400 men, a survey was made in December of 1944, and they found that 1,200 men, of the men who had

originally gone into the One Hundredth died, and of those who had been added to the One Hundredth, 1,200 had been wounded.

Quoting a story from the Stars and Stripes of last year, 10,000 men went through the One Hundredth and Four Hundred and Forty-second Infantry, either as original members or as replacements, and of those 10,000 about 4,500 men were wounded. The One Hundredth Battalion was known in Europe as the Purple Heart Battalion. General Reilert made the statement it was the best troops in his division. They were the pets of Gen. Mark Clark. I say pets, because they produced. They were one of the most highly decorated units in the United States Army, if not the most highly decorated. The Four Hundred and Forty-second, including the One Hundredth Battalion, had five distinguished unit citations—that's the Presidential citation—65 Distinguished Service Crosses, about 250 Silver Stars, and 700 Bronze Stars. A Bronze Star, by the way, in the European theater was not given for meritorious service, but bravery. In the Pacific it is used largely for meritorious service. General Dolphus, of the Thirty-sixth Division, said they displayed soldierly qualities that had never been exceeded in the history of the United States Army.

As far as loyalty is concerned, there was bound to be some question, when the Japanese started their attack, presented their attack on Pearl Harbor. It's a logical thing to question men of that nationality in a war with their own people. There were some men who were questioned, even up to the time we left for overseas. When they finally came around, the intelligence people from Camp Shelby, and asked me if I was willing to take every man in my battalion, I stated I was without question. Those cases were usually from information based on the fact that they had gone to Japan at one time in their life, possibly for education, possibly for a visit to the old people out there. They dropped every case, and I said, "Does that mean the dosiers you prepared against these men will be destroyed?" As far as I know, we never heard of them again. A good many of those men are now dead.

Chairman DELANEY. Any questions?

Colonel TURNER. I have a statement which is being prepared, is being typed, and it has been prepared, and I'd like to present that when it has been prepared.

Chairman DELANEY. Do you wish to submit it and make it a part of the record?

Colonel TURNER. Yes, sir.

Chairman DELANEY. Without objection, it will be so ordered. [Statement No. 16.]

Delegate FARRINGTON. Can you state the number of men in those units that lost their lives?

Colonel TURNER. There were 37—just a second, I have the figures right here. Taking into consideration the fact that the Four Hundred and Forty-second was composed of not only men from Hawaii but also the United States, mostly from California—the figures include the entire group—there were 36 officers and 614 men killed. Those are taken from the official figures of the Four Hundred and Forty-second Combat Team.

Delegate FARRINGTON. Most of those men were from Hawaii.

Colonel TURNER. Most of those men were from Hawaii, that's correct.

Chairman DELANEY. The Chair recognizes Mr. Angell.

Representative ANGELL. May I ask, were there any cases of disloyalty of our men in the service of Japanese ancestry, that is, any higher percentage, if there were any, than other troops?

Colonel TURNER. Up to the time I left, which was in October 29 of 1943, when they found out how old I was and kicked me out, there were absolutely no cases of disloyalty, and to the best of my knowledge none since. There was one case of a man who I believe deserted. They picked him up, and I believe he went back into good standing.

Chairman DELANEY. Thank you very much, Colonel. The Chair recognizes Judge Robertson.

Mr. ROBERTSON. We present Mr. Robert L. Shivers, formerly of the FBI.

(Colonel Turner withdraws, and Mr. Shivers takes the witness chair.)

Mr. SHIVER. Gentlemen, I have prepared a written statement outlining the cooperation received from the various racial communities, racial people here, prior to and subsequent to the attack on December 7, 1941.

Chairman DELANEY. I see here, just by way of qualification, you are a former FBI agent. Were you in charge at the time?

Mr. SHIVERS. I was in charge of the FBI here from August—from April 1939 until—August 1939 until April 1943. I was employed by the FBI for 24½ years. I became collector of customs at this port on July 1, 1944.

Chairman DELANEY. You now hold that position?

Mr. SHIVERS. I now hold that position.

Chairman DELANEY. Do you wish to make your statement part of this record?

Mr. SHIVERS. I would like to, sir.

Chairman DELANEY. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The document was received, and marked "Statement No. 17.")

Chairman DELANEY. Now, have you a comment to make upon the high spots?

Mr. SHIVERS. I have refuted all of the rumors and gossip and stories that have been published on the mainland about sabotage, and fifth-column activities, in the Hawaiian Islands. I have also set forth in some detail the efforts that were made by all racial groups in this community to prepare the islands for war, and to condition them for that eventuality. I have no particular comment to make, unless some of you gentlemen want to ask me a question.

Representative MILLER. Yes, I'd like to ask a question. Mr. Shivers, people have come to me, one or two people, let me put it that way, and have subtly tried to leave this thought. I'd like to get your reaction to it. That the reason there was no sabotage on the island was because of the OCD and other activities that were so rigid that there couldn't be any sabotage because of the fine organization that the Army, yourself, and the civilians put up.

Mr. SHIVERS. Very, very elaborate precautions had been made to cope with any form of sabotage that might have happened here at that time. I told General Short at least 3 months before Pearl Harbor

that there was no organized sabotage ring in the Hawaiian Islands, and that we need not fear any organized sabotage. Now the reason it did not occur was not because of the elaborate precautions that were taken. It was because there was no organized effort here to commit sabotage.

Representative ANGELL. Obviously, we of the committee had no opportunity to read your statement.

Mr. SHIVERS. Yes, sir.

Representative ANGELL. You perhaps were aware of the fact that soon after the attack here at Pearl Harbor there were various rumors throughout the continental United States, and particularly that many of Japanese origin here on the island were in league with the mother country, and were giving aid and comfort to our enemy, after the attack. Have you covered that in your statement?

Mr. SHIVERS. I have covered a number of the rumors that were rampant, such as the fact that some of the aviators who were shot down over the islands that morning were wearing McKinley High School rings, and the fact that arrows were cut in the cane fields pointing toward Pearl Harbor to guide the Japanese aviators to their targets.

Representative ANGELL. Another one that I heard, that a truck drove down on the field——

Mr. SHIVERS. I covered that in——

Representative ANGELL. And shot the aviators as they came out of their living quarters.

Mr. SHIVERS. There was a rumor that a milk truck, that the sides of this milk truck suddenly collapsed on the field and the Japanese machinegunned the troops. All of that was poppycock.

Representative ANGELL. No basis of fact?

Mr. SHIVERS. No basis of fact.

Representative TAYLOR. How about the rumor there was a large stock of guns and ammunition found on the island of Hawaii?

Mr. SHIVERS. That was not true. There was no large stock of ammunition. As a matter of fact, there was no ammunition found anywhere, except some buried up at the old Oahu junk yard, and that was found after December the 7th. That was very small caliber ammunition, shotgun shells and 22's.

Representative TAYLOR. Were you in charge of the Federal Bureau of Investigation at that time?

Mr. SHIVERS. I was, sir.

Representative TAYLOR. Therefore, you would have been in a position to have determined if there was any basis in fact for these so-called rumors?

Mr. SHIVERS. As a matter of fact, sir, we investigated very thoroughly and very carefully every one of those rumors.

Representative TAYLOR. It's your statement, then, to the committee——

Mr. SHIVERS. That all of those rumors were false and were not based on facts.

Delegate FARRINGTON. Mr. Shivers, in the work that you carried on as a local director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, did you have the assistance of many Americans of Japanese ancestry?

Mr. SHIVERS. We had the assistance of literally hundreds of them, Mr. Farrington, both before, during and after the attack on Pearl Harbor, and all of that is carefully set out in the statement.

Chairman DELANEY. Any other questions? (No response.) Thank you, Mr. Shivers. The Chair recognizes Judge Robertson.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That's the end of our agenda today, for this morning, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman DELANEY. Thank you, Judge.

Representative MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I had asked Mr. Harold Boss, Director of Civil Service and Classification, to prepare a statement. I think it's quite important that that be put in the record, and I ask at this time that it be done.

Chairman DELANEY. Without objection, so ordered.

(The document was received, and marked "Statement No. 18.")

Representative LARCADE. I'd like to make a point at this time. We have completed what I think covers a presentation of the Equal Rights Commission, authorizing Judge Robertson to make this presentation to the committee, and apparently we have concluded hearing the witnesses, the names of which were submitted to the committee, and before proceeding further with the hearings I think it would be in order for Judge Robertson to close his case, in order that the committee may proceed to the hearing of other citizens who might desire to testify generally for or against statehood.

Chairman DELANEY. What's your opinion on that gentlemen? It will take about 10 minutes for the Judge.

Delegate FARRINGTON. I think we should hear it.

Representative LARCADE. How long will your statement take, Judge?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Of course properly to sum this up it would take all day, but that's neither practical nor necessary. I can boil down what I have to say in a comparatively few minutes.

Representative LARCADE. About how long, Judge?

Mr. ROBERTSON. It will be 15.

Representative ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, I suggest that we hear the judge immediately after we reconvene after the luncheon hour; is that agreeable to you, Judge Robertson?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I'll do whatever the committee wants me to do.

Chairman DELANEY. 2 o'clock.

(The meeting recessed at 12:10 p. m., to reconvene at 2 p. m., January 15, 1946.)

AFTER RECESS

Representative James J. Delaney of New York acting as chairman pro tem.

Chairman DELANEY. The committee will come to order. The Chair will recognize Mr. Larcade.

Representative LARCADE. Ladies and gentlemen, on behalf of the committee, I wish to make this public announcement: Due to a change in plans, the time for the departure of our committee has been advanced, on account of flying weather to the mainland, and the committee expects to leave Oahu early Saturday morning. Consequently

this necessitates a rearrangement of our schedule of hearings and of our program.

While it is the primary purpose of the visit of this committee to hold hearings on the question of statehood, and on other matters pertaining to the affairs of the Territory, the Territories Committee is charged with the consideration of all problems affecting generally the Territory on all matters and questions relating to the administration of its affairs, and the welfare of the Territory and of its people.

As may have been observed, the committee has devoted all of its time to public hearings, both on Oahu and on the other islands of the Territory, and as a result we have had no time to give to other functions of the committee.

It is in keeping with the obligations and duties of this committee to make an investigation and inspection of the over-all problems of the Territory, including the harbor, military and naval installations, the educational institutions, health, economic problems, and other matters relating to the interests and future development of this island of the Territory.

Under the circumstances, we find it necessary to allocate at least 1 day for an inspection of the island of Oahu. On Friday, the committee is scheduled to hold hearings on the island of Kauai. Therefore the committee has decided that in view of the fact that it is anticipated that all of those who desire to appear to testify for or against statehood, or other matters, shall have been given an opportunity to do so after the hearings this afternoon and tonight, that the hearings scheduled for Wednesday, January 16, here, be canceled and if all persons desiring to appear before the committee have not been heard at the end of the hearing tonight that the hearings be resumed on Thursday, January 17, at the usual hour.

The committee desires to reiterate that it is their purpose, insofar as is in reason, to make it possible for all interested parties to appear and testify for or against statehood, as it is our desire that after we leave the Territory no one may claim that they did not have an opportunity to appear before the committee, for or against statehood. In this connection, the committee has noted that one of the important and distinguished members of the senate, Mrs. Alice Kamokila Campbell, has indicated to the press that she desired to appear before this committee in opposition to granting statehood to the Territory of Hawaii. May I say personally, and on behalf of the committee, that upon the arrival here in Honolulu, it was our pleasure to meet Senator Campbell, and we immediately invited Senator Campbell to testify before our committee, for in view of the fact that Senator Campbell supported statehood in 1940, and that she now opposes statehood, the committee was interested in and desired to give Senator Campbell every consideration and opportunity to appear before the committee and give her reasons for her changed position, as we desire to include in our proceedings and report, a full and complete record in regard to the attitude of the people of Hawaii on this important question. Therefore, the committee desires to extend to Senator Campbell every opportunity to appear before the committee, and we now extend to Senator Campbell a special invitation to appear before the committee, either this evening, or, if necessary, we will hold a special hearing on Thursday morning, January 17, at 10, at which time we will arrange to recog-

nize and give to Senator Campbell a full opportunity to appear and testify before this committee.

The same invitation is extended to any other person in this Territory who desires to testify before this committee, and has not had an opportunity to do so.

Chairman DELANEY. For the summation, the Chair will recognize Judge Robertson.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Before proceeding with that, Mr. Chairman, may I file a written statement of army commendations on the war record of the people of Hawaii. I might say in this connection that the people from this Territory who went to the battle front were not confined to local born Japanese, but covered every race group of this Territory.

This, Mr. Chairman, is a general statement.

Chairman DELANEY. Without objection it may be received. [Exhibits No. 65 A, B, C, D.]

Mr. ROBERTSON. I am requesting to present also a resolution adopted by the Hawaii Chinese Civic Association favoring immediate statehood for Hawaii. [Exhibit No. 66.]

Delegate FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I have been handed by the chairman of the Republican Central Committee a series of affidavits relating to the absence of sabotage during the period of the war, and I would like to ask the unanimous consent of the committee that it be inserted in the record immediately after the testimony of Mr. Roy A. Vitousek.

Chairman DELANEY. Without objection it is so ordered. [Exhibits No. 67 A to N.]

Mr. ROBERTSON. I have here a written statement from the Hawaiian Homes Commission, which I understand was requested by the committee.

Representative ANGELL. I think, Mr. Chairman, that is the information I requested. [Statement No. 19.]

Chairman DELANEY. May I ask Judge Robertson if the resolution passed by the chamber of commerce has been offered. I understood one was passed by the local president.

Mr. ROBERTSON. It was not yet filed, but the president of the chamber of commerce is here this afternoon. I understand that the committee wants to hear from him.

Under the head of "Land Monopoly," there has been considerable reference made here to the Bishop estate. I have here a statement concerning the land holdings of the Bishop estate which has been prepared by the trustees, and they have authorized me to offer it if the committee would like to have it.

Chairman DELANEY. Do you want it in there?

Representative ANGELL. I would suggest it go in, Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that so much testimony has a bearing on that.

Chairman DELANEY. So ordered.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Thank you, I will file it. [Exhibit No. 68.]

There has also been handed me for presentation a printed pamphlet headed, "Educational Policy of Kamehameha Schools," rather interesting reading for anybody who is interested in that line of thought. If the committee would like this to be filed, I will file it.

Delegate FARRINGTON. I move it be filed as an exhibit.

Chairman DELANEY. One copy?

Mr. ROBERTSON. There are six copies here, one for each member of the committee. [Exhibit No. 69.]

Chairman DELANEY. So ordered.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The committee, from time to time during the hearing has asked to be furnished with certain data from the government office. That data is now being prepared, and we will file it as soon as it is ready.

Does the committee wish to hear a little argument?

Chairman DELANEY. You may proceed.

Mr. ROBERTSON. At the outset of this hearing the Equal Rights Commission, as a proponent of Delegate Farrington's bill, expected to convince this committee of three things. First, that the people of this Territory are fully capable of self-government; secondly, that they are entitled to receive full rights of American citizenship; and, thirdly, that Hawaii should now be admitted into the Union as the forty-ninth State.

I believe that these three propositions have been completely established at this hearing. I do not think I need to argue to this committee that the people of this Territory are fully capable of self-government. It seems to me that that is obvious. It must be obvious to this committee.

For more than half a century prior to the annexation, the people of these islands did maintain, and did successfully maintain, a government. From 1840 to 1893 the form of government was a monarchy. From 1894 to 1898 the form of government was that of a republic. During all that period of years the people of this Territory maintained self-government under a written constitution. And until the time came for annexation, these islands, first the Hawaiian kingdom, and secondly the Republic of Hawaii, were recognized by the world powers as an independent nation. The people of these islands were able to maintain that situation by and through their own efforts and capacity.

Since 1900 when the organic act was established, we have continued to maintain self-government here according to the regulations prescribed by the organic act. I contend that the evidence which this committee has received shows that we have made a good job of it.

Now, it seems to me further, that if, as I believe, the people of this Territory have demonstrated their capacity for self-government, it follows logically, as a matter of course, that they are entitled to receive the full rights of American citizenship.

The third point is, whether or not the time has now come when Hawaii should be admitted as a State of the Union. It seems to me that that logically follows from the first two points, unless there is some extraneous consideration entering into the picture that calls for further delay. My point of view is that there is no reason for further delay. When the previous committees were here in 1935 and 1937, the opponents of statehood appeared and stated their views. Mr. John Stokes appeared in 1935 and 1937 and opposed the admission of Hawaii into the Union because he mistrusted the Japanese residents of Hawaii. He took the view that the Japanese-American citizens could not be trusted. The other day he appeared here with

exactly the same point of view. He still thinks the Japanese cannot be trusted.

In adhering to that view, Mr. Stokes shuts his eyes to certain very obvious facts. He shuts his eyes to the fact that the Japanese language schools that previously existed here have been permanently abolished. He shuts his eyes to the fact they, by the test of bloody war have demonstrated their loyalty, not only on the battle fronts, but here on the home front they have shown themselves to be thoroughly loyal and dependable citizens.

It seems to me that the events which have happened since Mr. Stokes was last before the committee in 1937 have put the Japanese situation in an entirely different aspect, and the aspect as it now exists must be said to be favorable to the Japanese, Hawaiian-born population.

Some people have criticized our legislature. I don't know that that is a very strange thing. Some of our people say that our legislators are a group of dumbbells, and such as that. I venture to say that there is no State in the Union where some people are not complaining about their legislature. We only have to read the columnists in the public press to see that Congress itself is the subject of a great deal of criticism. But that is inevitable. People are not all of the same mind or of the same point of view. There is necessarily bound to be difference of opinion. So far as Hawaii is concerned, the ability of the legislature is shown by the result of their labors, and it appears that the fact is, as shown to this committee by reliable evidence, that the legislation of this Territory is modern, efficient, and up-to-date.

We have heard a great deal in this connection about land monopoly. Following the establishment here of a Territorial form of government, considerable discussion ensued among our people as to what should be the land policy of the Territory. Some took the view that the Territory should dispose of all of its land, and put those lands into private ownership, where they could be used and developed for whatever purposes that they were adapted, as desired by the purchaser. They say, "Dispose of all the Territorial lands, the Territory would get its income in the shape of taxation while those lands were in private ownership." Another group took quite a different view. They maintained that the Territory should not dispose of any of its lands. It should hold them intact, and acquire the necessary revenue from the lands; that by holding the lands and leasing them out, the best interest of the Territory would be subserved.

While neither of these extreme views were followed, the fact remains that the Territory today is the owner of practically one-half of the lands of the Territory. Whether that is sound or not, perhaps, is a subject of opinion. But I believe that the evidence before this committee shows that the administration of public lands has been adequate and efficient.

Of course, under this general head of land monopoly the Bishop estate has been brought in, and the background of the Bishop estate has been shown to the committee. The lands that are now held by the trustees under Mrs. Bishop's will were the lands of the royal line of Kamehameha. In 1845 when Kamehameha III surrendered his feudal rights and appointed a commission, the royal title of the

Kamehameha family, of which there were several living at the time, went to them and they received their allotments according to the understanding of what they were entitled to at the time. Those lands, or those of them which had not been disposed of from time to time by the different owners, came down to Mrs. Bishop as the last of the Kamehameha family. She had no children. She had no dependents. By her will she left those lands in trust for the benefit and education of the boys and girls of the Hawaiian race. It was her property to dispose of as she saw fit. She made proper and appropriate provision, I think there can be no two sides to that question. That is the Bishop estate today, and that is how it originated. I do not call that a land monopoly. All these titles here are legitimate, legal titles. None of this property has been acquired by fraud, or anything of that description. These titles have come down, just as titles have come down on the mainland, exactly the same way. In no way are they different.

The evidence here shows that the Territory is in sound financial condition. The evidence shows that we have a tax system that is second to none when compared with tax systems on the mainland. The evidence shows that we have an effective and efficient health department. Nothing has been offered during this extensive hearing as to the unfitness of the Territory because of its financial condition, or its economics, as against its admission as a State.

In connection with the racial question, I expect the members of the committee, in their travels to the other islands, discovered that many people who voted against statehood in the plebiscite of 1940 are now lined up in favor of statehood. On the same day on which Mr. Stokes was making his anti-Japanese statements to this committee, Secretary Ickes in Washington, under the date line of January 10, 1946, UP dispatch:

Secretary of the Interior Ickes said today in a letter to the Washington Post that before the war he questioned if Hawaii should become a State, but the Japanese in Hawaii behaved so admirably during the war, I no longer feel that this question should be urged against statehood.

Wise men are able to change their opinions as the facts change.

The situation of a Territory is a somewhat anomalous one. As a permanent thing it is distinctly un-American. It involves not only taxation without representation, but it denies to the people themselves the right to participate in the enactment of laws by which they are governed. Naturally, that situation cannot possibly be accepted as a permanent thing under the Stars and Stripes, and it has not been so considered.

The United States Supreme Court has made itself very clear on that point in a number of decisions. In 1932 in a case decided by the Supreme Court, the Court said: "A sufficient foundation for these decisions"—referring to some prior decisions in respect to Territorial courts—"is to be found in the transitory character of the Territorial government." In other words, the Territorial government in and of itself is a mere temporary status, as the Supreme Court in another decision called it, a period of pupilage, not a permanent situation at all, but a temporary situation, to be rectified at the earliest practicable moment.

In the same case that I have in my hand here, the Supreme Court quoted this from an earlier decision: "The Territory under the Constitution and laws of the United States is an inchoate State." In those few words, I think the Supreme Court exactly covers the ground. A Territory is an inchoate State, culminating in full statehood at the earliest practicable moment, but to the end that Americanism may cover the whole country, and not merely those previously admitted to statehood.

It was the very clear understanding when these islands were annexed to the United States that we would have ultimate statehood. The very fact that Congress, in 1900, incorporated these islands as a Territory of the United States, and incorporated the islands in accordance with the very doctrine of the United States Supreme Court, that a Territory is a mere transitory, ephemeral condition, to be rectified as soon as practicable, whereby the Territory becomes a State.

It is utterly inconsistent with the American theory, and can be safely regarded only as a temporary status. The very philosophy of American Government is that the Government comes up from the people, whereas under the Territorial form of Government, the government is imposed on the people by some seemingly superior power, and without consent or participation by the people themselves. Those are the reasons why the Supreme Court has so clearly stated that the Territorial status is a mere temporary, transitory one.

On the thought that that was the understanding of all those concerned in the cession of these islands, I would like to say a few words. The Treaty of Cession which was submitted to the United States by the Republic of Hawaii in 1897, implied that these islands should be incorporated into the United States as an integral part thereof, and under its sovereignty. A joint resolution of Congress, known as the Newland's Resolution passed the following year, 1898, said—

that such cession is accepted, ratified and confirmed, and that said Hawaiian Islands be, and they are hereby annexed as a part of the territory of the United States.

In a case that came before the Supreme Court of the United States in 1903, the court held that although the adoption of the resolution of annexation did not fully extend the United States Constitution to Hawaii, the passage of the Organic Act did extend it completely, because the Organic Act made Hawaii an integral part of the United States. And that was the understanding of all concerned.

I have a few items corroboratory of my position. Senator Morgan of Alabama was a member of the commission of five appointed by the President to formulate the Organic Act for Hawaii, and he was out here more than once in that connection. He was here in 1898, and on September 10, 1898, in an address here, Senator Morgan said:

The Territory of Hawaii has a great future before it, and with the increase of population and business that must come from annexation and all that is implied by it, the road to statehood cannot be a long one.

That was the view of the commission that drafted the Organic Act. That was the view of the people of Hawaii, that by becoming an organized Territory of Hawaii, of the United States, we were on the road to statehood, and Senator Morgan told us, "Your road will not

be a long one." That commission drafted the Organic Act. It went before Congress in the form of a bill. That bill was considered first in the Senate. When the bill was before the Senate and was being debated, Senator Platt, of Connecticut offered an amendment, by which he proposed to add a new section to the bill. That section, as he had drafted it, read as follows:

Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed, taken, or held to imply a pledge or promise that the Territory of Hawaii will at any future time be admitted as a State, or attached to any State.

Senator Hoar of Massachusetts protested against that and raised a point of order, which was sustained. Senator Platt's proposed amendment, so far as the Senate was concerned, was defeated. The bill passed the Senate, and was up for debate, before the House, then Congressman Hill of Connecticut—I don't know what these Connecticut people had against Hawaii. Many of our young men have gone to Yale for their education, and made a good showing there—nevertheless, these gentlemen from Connecticut were against us. So Congressman Hill of Connecticut in the House introduced a proposed amendment in exactly the same form as Senator Platt presented to the Senate, in other words, declaring the passage of the Organic Act should not imply the promise that Hawaii would at some future time be admitted as a State. That proposed amendment came to a vote, in the House of Representatives, and as the Congressional Record shows, the amendment was rejected without a recorded vote. By that action of the gentlemen of the Congress, Congress committed itself, not only to the organization of these islands as a Territory of the United States, but regarded the status of Territory as a stepping stone of statehood, and by the rejection by Congress of Senator Platt's proposed amendment in the Senate, and Congressman Hill's proposed amendment in the House, Congress at that time went clearly on record.

The question was asked this morning: What benefit would the admission of Hawaii as a State of the Nation be to the Nation? You see, gentlemen, first and foremost it would be the discharge by Congress of at least a moral obligation owing to the people of this Territory. The taking of a contrary view at the present time would be to repudiate the action of Congress of 1900; it would be repudiating the plain understanding that was had at the time by those who had to do with the introduction and the passage of the Organic Act.

The American people love to see fair play. They always approve of a square deal, and denying the admission of Hawaii as a State, in view of all the past circumstances, would be other than giving a square deal to the people of this Territory and the discharge of an obligation that Congress really owes to us.

The people of the United States, including those in Congress, heretofore have invariably had their attention directed to the eastward, to the Atlantic and to Europe. Practically no attention was being given to the westward to the Pacific and to the Orient.

It has been pointed out this morning, and this matter was discussed considerably this morning, this Territory can undoubtedly be a help to the Nation by sending to the Senate and the House men of the caliber of Delegate Farrington, men of the caliber of former Delegate King and Houston, who have the Pacific at their fingertips.

That is what we in this part of the world have been concerned with, even though it has not attracted the attention of the mainlander. Undoubtedly this territory can furnish Congress with men who, by their knowledge, by their experience, could be of manifest help to the Nation in the halls of Congress.

For more than 40 years, gentlemen, we have striven patiently; we have striven loyally, and we have striven hopefully for admission into the American Union. We are thoroughly of the mind that we have earned it; that we deserve it, and should have it.

Chairman DELANEY. Mr. Larcade, I understand that the Secretary of the Territory would like to make a statement for the record. Is he present?

Mr. D. HEBDEN PORTEUS. Perhaps there was a misunderstanding. I was the one who made the request on behalf of the house of representatives.

Chairman DELANEY. On behalf of the house of representatives, you are recognized.

Representative PORTEUS (Hawaii). Thank you very much. My name is D. Hebden Porteus. I am now a member of the house of representatives, and have been a member for the last several terms. I am not appearing here as an individual, nor as a representatives of any political party, but I would like to speak to you on behalf of many of the members of both the Democratic and Republican party of our local house of representatives.

I had hoped that many of the members of the house would have the opportunity of appearing before this committee. However, as we have discussed this, we feel that it is very essential that all the facts concerning statehood, and all the facts concerning the economic life of the Territory, as well as its political life, be in the record. Therefore, the others have asked me to appear before you, and to tell you that we heartily endorse statehood, and we hoped that statehood would be ours immediately, and that by the next session of the legislature we will be in a position to supplement any legislation which you gentlemen, we hope, will sponsor in Congress, or at least, assist our delegate in its passage, which will call for the immediate election, first of delegates to, and then the holding of a constitutional convention for these islands.

This, of course, in my presentation to you, is not political. I am appearing, as I say, representing both Democrats and Republicans, but still, it is a political issue. We felt that we should appear before you and say that we do heartily endorse this position.

We would like to compliment the Equal Rights Commission for performing so ably the function for which it was created. The decision urging statehood is a specific one, which was set forth in legislation creating this commission. We believe, too, that the choice of Judge Robertson as the attorney for this commission was particularly a happy one, not only in view of his skill, but in view of his background with a knowledge of both the legal and economic and political events of this Territory as a Territory as well as a republic. We hope that you have no questions with respect to our particular legislation. We are happy to answer any questions that you may have, either with respect to legislation, or otherwise, but we did not come early before you because we felt that you would appreciate having

evaluation of that legislation by third parties rather than to have the members of the legislature appear before you, and tell you that the legislation which they had passed was the only proper legislation which should have been passed.

I think, perhaps, others, too, who have appeared before you, have adequately answered questions on bloc voting. However, any of the members of the legislature on their part at this particular hearing would be very happy to appear at any time if you desire for any questions that you may have on these subjects.

We hope that when this body returns to Congress that you will present a favorable report, since we so sincerely believe in statehood. It leaves little doubt in our mind that a sincere case presented in that form can hardly fail to impress you gentlemen. So I am anticipating, possibly, your position, and I do hope that once you get back to Congress, once the report is written, that you will permit us to help you in any way that we possibly can in order to get proper legislation through Congress. We hope that this is a historic committee. We certainly hope that after your report is filed, that we will be able to rely on you, both as a body, and as individuals for your advice on the next steps that we should take, if any. I am sure that the members, not only of the House, but those of the Senate, join me when I say that if there is any additional information you would like to have when you return to Washington, either as a body or as individuals, we would be very happy to gather anything we can and present that to you.

We appreciate very much your coming down here in such busy times, and are very, very grateful for the interest which you are giving to this matter, which is, of course, of intense importance to us.

Chairman DELANEY. Any questions?

Representative ANGELL. If I may ask a question: Would you state to the committee what percentage of the house and of the senate of the Territory would express a favorable vote on this question of statehood?

Representative PORTEUS. In the last session of the house we had several measures with respect to statehood. The house unanimously adopted a joint resolution, which would have gone back—in a concurrent resolution—which would have gone back to Congress. However, in the closing hours of the session, as to the inclusion of other matters within that petition, there was a difference between the house and the senate, and the house unanimously then adopted a resolution which had been drafted with the different members of the Hawaii Equal Rights Commission, which was introduced by Vice Speaker Hiram Fong, and that, too, unanimously passed. That was a house resolution. I believe the senate took appropriate action on the house resolution. I am not just aware of what they did, however.

Representative ANGELL. Thank you.

Chairman DELANEY. Thank you, Mr. Porteus.

(Mr. Porteus was at this time excused and withdrew.)

Chairman DELANEY. The next we will call is Mr. H. P. Faye, chairman of the Chamber of Commerce of Honolulu.

Mr. H. P. FAYE. Mr. Chairman, and gentlemen, the records of this committee poll—

Chairman DELANEY. Pardon me, Mr. Faye, are you going to read that statement? [Statement No. 20.]

Mr. FAYE. I am just going to brief it.

Chairman DELANEY. Go ahead.

Mr. FAYE. I refer to the poll that was taken of the membership of the chamber of commerce, resulting in ballots being returned by 42 percent of the membership. The ballots returned indicate a vote of 509 in favor of statehood, and 170 against it, which is a ratio of 3 to 1. It was in contrast to the plebiscite held in 1940, where the vote was 2 to 1.

Based on this result of the membership poll, the board of directors of the Chamber of Commerce of Honolulu, at a board meeting held on January 7, voted unanimously for immediate statehood, and prepared a resolution endorsing statehood being presented to this congressional committee. A copy of this resolution is filed herewith. [Exhibit No. 70.]

The members of the Chamber of Commerce of Honolulu, the members of firms and individuals of all races, not only of the largest firms, but also the small firms, followed this procedure. The break-down of that membership across racial lines reveals that there are 804 Caucasians and part-Hawaiians, 302 Japanese, 141 Chinese, 34 Koreans, and 26 Filipinos, who are members of the Chambers of Commerce of Honolulu.

Figures concerning the business of Hawaii have been prepared for your records from the official sources, special presentation having already been made covering the sugar, pineapple, diversified agriculture, coffee, and fishing.

Under the head of the business of the Territory, statistical data, appear exhibits covering business generally. On the subject matter of banks, trust companies, building and loan associations, public utilities, number of business establishments, number of persons engaged in various types of business, retail sales per capita, and matter relating to the sugar plantations, by number of plantations, showing the percentage of sugar production.

The bank deposits, these official tables, establish the fact that Hawaii is in a healthy economic condition, and supports its government and its public services well, and is a part of the body politic.

This information was provided by the Statehood Committee which visited Hawaii in 1937, regarding the previous hearing on statehood, covering every phase of our community life, including industry, trade, commerce, and of finance, and contained a complete and detailed data in support of Hawaii's qualifications for statehood. These statistics have been brought up to date and the exhibits mentioned. This data is even more convincing, and demonstrates Hawaii's qualification for immediate statehood.

I should like to add to this statement that this further statement on this business presentation, that Mr. Stanley C. Kennedy will give. He will speak on interisland transportation. Mr. Randolph Sevier, I understand, is not to appear, but to have this statement to file with the committee. Mr. Roy C. Kesner, president of the Retail Board for 1945, has a statement on retailing and small businesses.

Mr. Valentine B. Libbey, chairman of the Public Utilities Commission, also on public utilities.

Included in the statistical data I mentioned are figures covering banks, trust companies, building and loan associations, and the administration of the Territorial Industrial Loan Act, Mr. A. J. Cantrelle, controller, bank examiner, is here, prepared to make a statement if the committee wishes to hear him on that subject. [See Exhibits Nos. 6 g-i.]

Chairman DELANEY. Are there any questions?

Delegate FARRINGTON. Mr. Faye, I assume that you are familiar with the charges that have been made by some prominent public officials, and others who are not so prominent, that the economic structure of this Territory is monopolistic, and in consequence of that that it dominates all phases of our life, not only economic, but politically and socially. Those charges have been repeated so often in this proceeding, and prior to this time, I think the members of the committee would appreciate hearing from you, as a man who has spent many years in the sugar industry, and as president of the chamber of commerce, presumably representing the business of this community, whatever comment you care to make on it, insofar as that has been urged as a reason for not granting the Territory the privileges of statehood.

Mr. FAYE. I have read some of the testimony on that subject in the press. I think the question can be more easily answered if the term "monopoly" used was a little more closely defined. When you speak of monopoly of the sugar industry, I wonder just what is meant by a monopoly on sugar. Certainly, the Hawaiian sugar industry does not monopolize any phase of the national industry. It is conducted by 36 plantations, grouped together in what we call an agency system, under five agency companies, for administration purposes.

Delegate FARRINGTON. Well, can you describe something of the organization of the sugar industry by way of illustrating the basis upon which it is organized, and for what purpose?

Mr. FAYE. The sugar industry, of course, is organized for the purpose of producing sugar. The industry is organized under the laws of corporate agriculture. The 36 plantations are separate corporate entities either owning their land in fee, or leasing their lands, either from the Territorial government, or from private estates, and in some cases from the Catholic Church.

The sugar plantation companies are operating companies, in the sense that the managers in the field, on the ground, are operating men, charged with the job of producing sugar, growing cane, and manufacturing from the cane the raw sugar. The agency companies under which the sugar-producing companies operate, are in a sense administrative companies. Their administrative functions, of which there are a multitude, are taken care of, such as centralized accounts, centralized in taking care of tax problems, in the central agency office. The agencies furnish technical staffs for the benefit of plantations, in the sense of agronomists, agricultural engineers, and technological assistants. The centralized agency office takes care of the shipping and the marketing of sugar. They take care of the finances of the plantation, advancing moneys whenever necessary, and

carrying the plantations on overdrafts, without security. I think that, in brief, covers the plantation agencies fully. If I have not covered it, if there are any further questions I overlooked, I would be glad to answer them to the committee.

Chairman DELANEY. Any questions?

Representative TAYLOR. What position did the chamber of commerce take on statehood in the plebiscite of 1940?

Mr. FAYE. They made no appearance at the time as an organization.

Representative ANGELL. There were a fairly substantial part of your members of the chamber of commerce voted against statehood. What was the principal argument that they entertained, or the reason?

Mr. FAYE. There was no reason stated on the ballot. The ballot just came in "yes," or "no."

Representative ANGELL. As an official of the chamber of commerce, you know, no doubt, the major reasons that they entertained?

Mr. FAYE. Well, sir, the membership of the chamber of commerce represents the same cross section of the community as any other organization. I would say that the same pros and cons entered into their individual opinion, on the situation, as indicated by the plebiscite of 1940, as would be indicated in advocates against, or the proponents for anything in any walk of life.

Representative ANGELL. Is the tax problem a major feature of this?

Mr. FAYE. The tax problem?

Representative ANGELL. Yes. Under statehood, it might entail larger taxes than under the Territorial form of government.

Mr. FAYE. I have never heard that discussed seriously. You heard it said that it would cost the State a little bit more, because it would not have the Federal funds for the payment of some of our officials, but I have not really heard that advanced as a serious argument against statehood.

Representative ANGELL. In the set-up that you described with reference to the ownership and operation of the sugar plantations, are plantations owned by separate interests, other than the agencies? Do the agencies own a controlling interest, in many instances, of the plantations?

Mr. FAYE. In many instances, from my general knowledge, I would say that the ownership in the plantations is rather widely held. I cannot cite the exact figures, but the figures that were submitted in the hearing of 1937, which appear in the record, indicated a distribution of about 15,000 stockholders, approximately, 11,000 resident in Hawaii, and 5,000 on the mainland of the United States. Now, in some cases the agency does own an interest in the plantation company. In some cases it has no interest. In other cases a small interest. In other cases a more substantial interest.

Representative ANGELL. In no instances do the plantations themselves do marketing, the agencies handle entirely that end of the business of the plantation.

Mr. FAYE. That is correct. The reason for that is that the plantations are scattered over the four major islands, and some of them in remote places. If each plantation were to handle its own—I mean all these functions that I mentioned—there would have to be identifica-

tion of employees, shipping personnel—talking about shipping. This system of handling all that is concentrated in the plantation agencies, in the head office in Honolulu.

Representative ANGELL. What is the basis of the compensation for the agencies?

Mr. FAYE. That varies. In some cases the compensation is on a fee basis, with some variation. In others, it is a percentage.

Representative ANGELL. Of the product handled?

Mr. FAYE. Of the sales.

Representative ANGELL. On a fee basis; how is the fee determined?

Mr. FAYE. I could not answer that, sir, because I am not familiar with all the details as to how the fee basis is worked out. I do not happen to know intimately or at first hand.

Representative ANGELL. On what percentage, if it is on a percentage basis, on what percentage of the product marketed?

Mr. FAYE. Speaking for one company that I know at first hand, not wishing to commit myself on something that I am not personally familiar with, the fee is $2\frac{1}{4}$ percent of the gross sales.

Representative ANGELL. The value of the gross sales?

Mr. FAYE. Yes.

Representative ANGELL. I think that is all.

Representative MILLER. You mentioned three large landholders, if I remember, and you brought out the name of the Catholic church. That is strange to me. What is the extent of their holding here?

Mr. FAYE. I could not answer that, sir. I just have the knowledge that in some cases the plantations do lease land owned by the Catholic church.

Representative MILLER. Are they extensive?

Mr. FAYE. In this particular case, not much, but substantially.

Representative MILLER. I was looking down through this booklet entitled "Land Monopoly." I see on the island of Oahu, they are listed about the twenty-second in order, only 1,578 acres of land. I was wondering why the Catholic church was singled out by you in your statement. Do they have any interlocking connection with any of these factors or other people on the island?

Mr. FAYE. I don't think so, sir. Some of the members may be stockholders.

Representative MILLER. Some of the members, yes, but the church itself?

Mr. FAYE. Some members of the church may be stockholders.

Representative MILLER. I am not interested in that. I am not concerned with whether a man of some religious organization is interested. I am not interested in what his religious convictions are, nor am I in his racial origin, in that respect, but of these 15,000 stockholders, is the interest of these companies fairly well distributed, or is it as is the old Spanish custom that obtains on the mainland, that of issuing 15 to 20 shares to be divided among a lot of small shareholders, then you can go out and say that this company is not a monopoly, it is held extensively, but that 90 percent of it is controlled by the group of interests here?

Mr. FAYE. No.

Representative MILLER. Are you in a position to say?

Mr. FAYE. It is widely distributed, in some cases, in substantially large holdings.

Representative MILLER. That's all.

Mr. FAYE. In other words, I would say that the condition that you describe does not exist.

Chairman DELANEY. Is that all? Are there any further questions? (At this point Mr. H. P. Faye was excused and withdrew.)

Chairman DELANEY. The Chair will now recognize Mr. Roy Kesner, president of the retail board, chamber of commerce.

Have you a prepared statement, Mr. Kesner?

Mr. ROY KESNER. I have, Mr. Chairman, but I would like to use it as a reference, and not to necessarily read it. As president of the retail board of the Chamber of Commerce of Honolulu, for the year 1945, I have been asked to present a statement.

Chairman DELANEY. Will you speak a little louder; come up so that everyone can hear you. Speak into the instrument.

Mr. KESNER. I have no hesitation in saying, in behalf of each and every one of the 525 members of our organization in the retail business, that the retail business in Hawaii is conducted, in general, in the same manner in the Territory as it is in comparable cities, or cities of comparable size on the mainland of America.

The total retail volume shown by the figures of the Territorial tax office for the year 1944, which was the last we have, was over \$386,000,000. This would indicate that the economic status of the population of Hawaii is very high.

Due to several factors, business in Hawaii has been rather free from what might be termed bad business practices. There have been some instances of misrepresentation on merchandise, misleading advertising, but on the whole, the retail business has been kept on a high plane, with honesty and integrity as a preventive rather than corrective measure. The retail board of the chamber of commerce was instrumental in the formation of the Better Business Bureau of Hawaii. This bureau had its institution on October 1, 1945, and it is affiliated with better business bureaus in over 85 cities on the mainland of the United States.

In further substantiation of the foregoing remarks concerning the interest of business in the Territory, the local Office of Price Administration has stated that violations of the regulations have been comparatively few, and of these a very large percentage were errors, and was not willful disregard of the directive of this office.

The total number of business establishments in the Territory as of 1945 is 36,875, and of this number 12,918 are retail establishments.

This development of business in the Territory shows conclusively that there is an opportunity here for everyone, regardless of race, creed or color, to establish for himself a small or a large business, depending on the capital available. Regardless of racial background, if an individual does desire to start a business of his own, if he is of good character, he will find friendly guidance and assistance from the finance agencies in Hawaii. This policy of helpfulness has resulted in the development of many small businesses, as the figure 36,875 would show.

There have been prepared by the tax office, for your committee's record, two tables, 6A and 6B, respectively. One of these tables shows

the number of business establishments in Hawaii for the calendar years of 1935 and 1945. Another shows the number of persons, including corporations, engaged in various types of business in 1945. Also, for your consideration, I am submitting for the record additional tables or data that I hope you will find helpful. [Exhibit No. 71.] These supplemented the tables in section 6 mentioned above. One shows freedom of enterprise in Hawaii, as evidenced by lists of mainland firms doing business on their own here, in competition with previously established similar local firms.

There is a statement, also, concerning possible new business enterprises that are worthy of any entrepreneur's attention. Another table shows the correlation between the length of time that the various immigrant groups have been here, and the preferred position those individuals now hold. Another shows the real property that the various racial groups acquired during the time that they lived in this Territory.

These tables are offered as basic evidence that Hawaii throughout the past decade has been the place of equal opportunity. Penniless immigrants have arrived here, and have accumulated property and wealth, and achieved preferred positions. All this data proves that Hawaii is a good place for the small man to do business, if he is honest and industrious, he has a better than even chance for success. [See exhibit No. 71.]

Chairman DELANEY. Are there any other questions?

Delegate FARRINGTON. Mr. Kesner, can it be truthfully said that one of the distinguishing features of business and industry in this Territory is that for the most part it is owned by people who reside in the Territory?

Mr. KESNER. I believe that is substantially so, as I stated here.

Delegate FARRINGTON. As a matter of fact, from general knowledge, you know that to be true.

Mr. KESNER. That is true, that they are owned by these residents of Hawaii.

Delegate FARRINGTON. Isn't it true, also, that there is a minimum of absentee ownership in most of our major enterprises?

Mr. KESNER. That I believe to be so, particularly so in the retail field, although, as I say, we have these mainland concerns, particularly two of rather large size, Kress and Sears, Roebuck, but they have more or less become an integral part of the community, by doing their business, following out community rules and regulations, and abiding by the community support that any local firm would have.

Delegate FARRINGTON. By and large, it is the policy of the companies that come in here from the States to extend to the local community such recognition as it possibly can in the employment of personnel, and by participating in welfare activities as well.

Mr. KESNER. That is true.

Delegate FARRINGTON. Insofar as it is the tradition of this community.

Mr. KESNER. That is very true. I think you will find that in the two firms just mentioned. Both of their resident managers have participated to a very great extent in the general community set-up, and have done their part in all of the community welfare work.

Delegate FARRINGTON. Before you came to Honolulu, you were in business in the States, were you not?

Mr. KESNER. Yes sir, but I was rather young when I first came over here.

Delegate FARRINGTON. I mean that you had sufficient experience in the States, by way of observation, if not actual occupation, to state that business in this community is not conducted in a manner that is very much different, for better or for worse, than it is in most cities of its size?

Mr. KESNER. Well, I don't want to draw any odious comparisons, but I do believe from my personal knowledge, from the little knowledge that I had had on the mainland on the way business is conducted, that over here it is on an indeed higher plane. There is less, if you want to use the term, "throat cutting," competition. Business is done on a pretty much up and up basis.

Delegate FARRINGTON. Isn't it true that the policy on employment with local business and industry generally has been to maintain personnel throughout the year?

Mr. KESNER. Yes. One of the reasons being that it was not convenient to—we do not have a ready labor market.

Delegate FARRINGTON. One reason is it was not convenient to go to the coast; the other was that they felt it was a matter of sounder policy?

Mr. KESNER. As far as the general retail business is concerned, and the small business of the Territory, that is definitely so. There is not very much of what we would call seasonal employment or unemployment. It is true usually during the time of the Christmas season, when the mailing of packages is necessary to get the Christmas presents away to the mainland. It might start from the first part of November, and run until the 25th of December. Then you take on a few extra individuals, who are probably housewives or someone looking for part-time employment for those months. But, on the over-all picture, the personnel are held on a permanent basis, and are not let out on a seasonal basis.

A statement might be made to the effect that in the depression years the firms in Hawaii have a fine record in retaining their old-time employees, irrespective of whether they were sliding over into the red. It was felt it was much better to possibly reduce salaries on an over-all basis down through the firm than to let anyone out and have him particularly suffer.

Delegate FARRINGTON. Isn't it true that most nationally advertised products are distributed in the Territory?

Mr. KESNER. Practically everything that the mainland exports we sell.

Delegate FARRINGTON. Isn't it a fact that from a business standpoint that Hawaii is regarded as an exceptionally good market?

Mr. KESNER. I believe it has been described as a particularly hot spot, so far as business is concerned.

Delegate FARRINGTON. Isn't there a tendency among the manufacturers of nationally advertised products to establish independent agencies rather than use distribution through old line factors?

Mr. KESNER. Well, the trend is both ways, when you say that the manufacturers establish their own particular branches over here, that has been done. They have worked through various established com-

panies over here, who act as representatives for the distribution of their products, and also there are a great portion of private individuals acting as commission merchants for the distribution of mainland goods.

Delegate FARRINGTON. That is all, Mr. Kesner.

Chairman DELANEY. Are there any other questions?

(At this time, Mr. Roy Kesner was excused and withdrew.)

Chairman DELANEY. The Chair now recognizes Mr. Stanley C. Kennedy, president of the Inter-Island Steam Navigation Co. and the Hawaiian Air Lines, Limited.

Mr. STANLEY C. KENNEDY. My name is Stanley C. Kennedy. I am president of the Inter-Island Steam Navigation Co., and the Hawaiian Air Lines. I was born in Hawaii, in this city, in 1890. My primary and high-school education was taken in this Territory. From here I went to Stanford University, where I graduated in 1912. From there I entered the employ of the Inter-Island Steam Navigation Co., and I have been with that company since, barring 18 months that I was in World War I as a naval officer in the Naval Reserve Corps.

Delegate FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman.

Chairman DELANEY. Mr. Farrington.

Delegate FARRINGTON. May I interrupt the proceedings at this point to say that in the legislative proceedings of this Territory, it has been the custom for many years to recognize the natal anniversary of the members of our legislative body, and in keeping with that tradition, some of his friends today would like to recognize the birthday of the distinguished member from California, Mr. Miller, who sits with this committee.

Representative MILLER. Do I have to tell how old I am?

Delegate FARRINGTON. You just have to rise. You do not have to tell how old you are.

(Representative Miller is presented with a birthday lei.)

Chairman DELANEY. May the chairman make this observation, that every member of the committee has had a birthday in the last week.

Mr. KENNEDY. I was instrumental in starting and sponsoring the Inter-Island Airways in 1929, which is now the Hawaiian Air Lines. I am appearing before this committee in support of statehood for Hawaii. It is my opinion that the people of Hawaii have proved capable in every way of governing themselves. They have also proved their loyalty, not only in World War I, but in World War II, and have a fine record to show for it.

The progress and development in agriculture and related industries, such as the transportation system of the island, social welfare, public health, and better education, and the general high standard of living in this Territory, I believe, entitle this community to the full consideration of the request that it has made for statehood.

Furthermore, taxation without representation, I believe, is not something that our government stands for. And I do believe, and I agree with Judge Robertson, that statehood is something that this Territory and the people here are entitled to.

I have submitted, in brief form—perhaps not so brief, because I have a 15-page brief here—covering a short history of the transportation in these islands, past, present, and what we are planning for the future, in both surface transportation and air transportation. I will

try to hit the high spots of this, gentlemen, and if there are any questions after I have given what I consider the high spots, I will be glad to answer any questions that might be put to me, or at least, I will attempt to. [Statement No. 21.]

The Territory of Hawaii, as you well know, with the little jaunt that you have made to Molokai, Hawaii, Maui, and the trip you will take to Kauai, is a community or a group of islands that spread about 400 miles. It can be said of any community such as this, that its economic and social situation depends on the adequacy of its transportation facilities. Unlike most States and communities, such as those that have highway systems, where private trucks and bus services are permissible, having several railroad lines coming to and from these communities, where they are connected by air lines as well, and in some instances surface transportation, Hawaii is different from those communities in that it has but two types of transportation, namely, surface or air.

I think it is germane in the question of statehood, therefore, that you consider the part which these two forms of transportation have played in the past development of this Territory, and consider, also, the adequacy of the present interisland system, and something of the plan which is now being given consideration to in meeting the future needs of the Territory.

Hawaii's surface transportation reads like a story, going back to the old days of the monarchy, under King Kamehameha I, when you might say that the only form of transportation then used was by the old ancient canoe. That period is generally known as the ancient Hawaiian canoe transportation period.

Although the economic needs of Hawaii at that time could be satisfied on each island as a unit, so far as fish, fuel, vegetables, and fruit, they were self-sufficient, but the canoes did play, however, a great part in the system of interisland communication, which played the part of radio, you might say, as well as the telephone, shipping, surface steamships and the airplane.

During Kamehameha I's reign, and his successor, King Kamehameha II, we had transportation taken care of by canoes. In fact, in the latter part of King Kamehameha's reign he was known to have had 700 or 800 canoes in service between these islands, and he carried on trade and commerce, together with other individuals, of the monarchy.

Later on in Kamehameha's reign he purchased small types of sailing ships, and in 1906 he was known to have 156 smaller sailing ships. These sailing ships that he had at the time were slow in movement. Many passages between these islands took seven days. They were not comfortable, but that was the only means of transportation at the time.

To secure a comprehensive and well-balanced picture of steam operation between these islands, and the part it played, one must follow the story from 1851, when the American steam schooner *Constitution* sought to establish interisland service, to the present day, when the islands are served by a modern fleet of steamers, operating on schedules sufficiently adapted to the needs of the community of approximately 500,000 people living on the seven islands.

Several attempts in 1852 and thereafter, were made by mainland capital. Mainland capital sent ships to Hawaii that in no way met

the requirements of the service. They were either too large and costly to operate; they were too slow; or too small. The owners were unwilling to build specially for the trade. That was one of the reasons why they failed. One attempt after another failed, and as a result no other mainlanders cared to risk their dollars in pioneering this operation, the development of which does take years. It was apparent that if the people of Hawaii were to have Hawaiian service for passengers and freight—a service obviously needed, by reason of this community's geographic make-up—it was up to the people of Hawaii to finance and operate their own vessels, although this meant greater original cost for designing ships specially for this trade. That was the only way that we could successfully operate shipping enterprises. When I say "we" I mean the people of the islands.

From that day to this, interisland transportation was developed by the island people themselves. I think following 1860 the Hawaiian Government helped considerably people that were willing to put their money into surface transportation here in the islands. They helped by means of construction subsidies, operating subsidies, and in one instance especially, the Hawaiian Steam Navigation Co., the Hawaiian Government gave it a franchise, to operate for 6 years exclusively between these islands. I simply cite this, gentlemen, to show you that at that time subsidies were in operation. But since Hawaii became a Territory, there has been no subsidization by the Government of the United States, in any operation between these islands. The only revenue that we received from Uncle Sam or the only revenue that any of the steamship companies after annexation received, was in the form of mail compensation, and that was no more than compensation for services performed.

The reciprocity treaty, after it was signed in 1876, marked the period of a very rapid development in agriculture. I think it has been already discussed before your committee, what this reciprocity treaty was, but it did do a lot to create this development, which did result in increased steamship building and operation.

Naturally, with the development of sugar, ships to bring that sugar to Honolulu had to be operated, so naturally more and more shipping following the signing of this Reciprocity Act of 1876.

In 1877, the steamship *Likelike*, built by the Government, mind you, and turned over to S. G. Wilder for operation before it arrived in Honolulu. That ship was the first ship of a fleet in the Wilder Steamship Co. that was founded about that time.

Capt. Tom Foster, who had been here for himself the *James McKay* in San Francisco in 1878, and following its arrival here, put it into service between the islands of Kauai and Honolulu. It was the first steamer in a scheduled operation between that island and this island.

For the next 20 years, these two companies—I have skipped a little—operated. The Inter-Island Steam Navigation Co. was incorporated in 1883, with Captain Foster, together with some of his associates. They were the original incorporators of this company. As I said, for the next twenty-odd years, these two companies operated between these islands. Each served separate islands, it being realized at the time that there was not sufficient business to warrant direct competition between these two vessels or steamship companies.

In 1905, in an endeavor to cut down the overlapping of the overhead, a merger was negotiated between these two companies by stock or cash being given to the stockholders of the Wilder Steamship Co. by the Inter-Island Steam Navigation Co.

Following this merger a reorganization and a new construction program was developed. Better and improved service was given to the people of the Territory. Transportation necessarily changes with the trade to be served, and this has been especially true in this Territory.

As I stated a short time ago, sugar helped to develop this transportation system. Sugar processed on the other islands, without harbors on these islands, had to come to Honolulu for trans-shipment to San Francisco. These sugar mills had to have supplies, stores, and equipment. Naturally, the operation companies took these supplies to those out-ports.

However, sugar is not a monopoly for Hawaii alone. There is too much sugar in this world for Hawaii to control the price. The economy of the Hawaiian worker had to be looked into. And it could be readily seen by the sugar people that the out-ports must be developed, and harbors built on the other islands, so that their sugar could go direct to the mainland, and saving the transportation haul to Honolulu for trans-shipment to the mainland. In fact, with this development that has happened during the past 20 years, the saving to the sugar people has been great. On the other hand, it is something that is economic. It is sound. No matter whether the then transportation companies could carry that sugar for 25 cents a ton to Honolulu, that would be 25 cents a ton more than they would have to pay to ship it to the mainland. So there is no reason to misjudge the sugar people in their efforts to get their sugar to the refiners at the lowest cost possible. They did. But I am just showing you how these trends changed the outlook of a going steamship operation in the islands.

The reverse of this has happened also in the pineapple industry. In the early twenties Lanai and Molokai were found to be excellent locations for the growing of pineapples. But a water shortage on those islands required the shipment of fresh fruit to Honolulu. That was something we had never had before. It was like a windfall for us, and to the ship operating companies that now haul sugar, Young Brothers and the Inter-Island. Specifically two definite types of equipment had to be designed and built for this fresh vegetable transportation. Today, Young Bros. have fleets of barges and tugboats that carry this sugar to Honolulu for processing.

Representative ANGELL. Is it all processed at Honolulu?

Mr. KENNEDY. No. There is some processed on Kauai, and some on Maui, but there is none processed on Hawaii or Lanai, or Molokai.

Although the development of harbors and terminals for deep water vessels on the off island has, and will continue to restrict the volume of traffic, there is no indication that this factor or any other will eliminate the necessity of frequent and dependable surface transportation between these islands. In fact, the more complete development of the Territory as a whole attaches an even greater importance to those services.

Enthusiasts may argue that the airplane will completely displace surface carriers in the not distant future, but this is not the opinion of even the air transport industry. On the contrary, the opinion of

informed persons is that the airplane, providing now an amount of transportation, will produce, through the furnishing of equipment and supplies necessary, and the building up of our out islands, additional traffic for the surface carrier. It may be more freight than passengers, but it will be additional freight and traffic for the surface carrier. Each form of transportation will undoubtedly have its place in the very important field of transportation.

We have mentioned sugar and pineapple. Now we will have the tourist business that shows real signs of growth. It showed real signs in the twenties, and there were announcements by modern carriers of building and of planning to build new types of fast, modern steamships to Hawaii, which naturally interested those of us who were in the transportation business locally. It meant more passengers, more freight, and to meet that situation that was approaching the islands the carrier at that time developed four new ships—a combination of passenger and freight ships—at a round-figure cost of \$5,000,000.

These ships are operating and have been for a number of years, and did take care of this increased business that followed the coming of these faster and newer ships from the mainland.

Ships required for service in these islands are not river boats, gentlemen. You have flown to the other islands, but once you have taken a channel trip on the surface, you will appreciate that our seas are not smooth. They are really rough. It requires staunch ships, and ships that are of ocean design. Naturally, those ships cost more, but they have to be built to stand the weather of these islands.

You might be interested to know that for the 10-year period, 1931 to 1941, local steamships carried 1,330,000 passengers, and 2,664,000 tons, exclusive of cattle. In the year 1940, the last year before the war—the last full commercial year before the war, steamers carried 158,000 passengers, and 216,000 tons of freight, and 18,000 head of cattle.

It would not be well at this time to close on the matter of surface transportation without mentioning the war work that these vessels of the Inter-Island fleet have done. On May 1, 1942, all of the company's steamers were requisitioned for charter by the War Shipping Administration. Previous to that time, as early as in the summer of 1941, two of our ships, and some of our barge and tugboat equipment were chartered, and went to the line islands with freight, to develop airports, and to take workers down to those line islands many thousands of miles south and southwest of here. These ships of ours, during this war, have done, I believe, an excellent job. The War Shipping Administration, on October 10, 1944, awarded a special certificate to the Inter-Island Steam Navigation Co. in recognition of the meritorious services to the United States in time of war.

And at this time I want to compliment the crews that we have in our island ships. The Hawaiians are real sailors. They were needed in many of these trips to the southern islands, and to the line islands, because there were shore operations. Our boys in these islands are tops on shore operations, and they are unquestionably good sailors; I will compare them with any in the world.

During these 4 years our ships have made many trips to these various islands, and in view of the function of transportation in the postwar era, and the return to stabilized business and economic conditions, the carrier is now studying the problem of future requirements

for these islands. The carrier is further planning an investment of \$3,000,000 in new equipment and facilities to serve the trade in as economical and satisfactory manner as possible. Plans and specifications of these new types are being developed, and just as soon as the plans are ready, the bids will be opened.

Now, with reference to our transportation, I just want to say at this time that the hotel business that our company has been in—the Inter-Island Steam Navigation Co.—is one that we are very much interested in as a carrier. We want to develop these islands. We want to see the movement of people of all classes to the out-lying islands. We are desirous of developing small types of hotels, or large, any type, with reasonable rates, so that when tourists do come to Hawaii, and local people as well, they can move to and from the islands at ease. The company has recently purchased property on Kauai, and has developed plans for the enlargement of a Kona Inn that it owns.

Air transportation between these islands started in 1929. Since then the Hawaiian Airlines has been operating, first with twin motored equipment, carrying 8 passengers, following that with 16-passenger amphibians, and in 1941 purchased its first Douglas DC 3 aircraft, which are now used on the mainland.

This company, during the war, has taken a burden, I believe, and handled passengers, with the surface craft being used primarily for the army and navy, especially during the early part of the war.

The aircraft carried as many as 160,000 passengers between these islands last year. In 1941, we carried about 60,000 people. It shows that this operation was geared to take care of increased travel that might be offered.

The air lines of this Territory was the first line that started air freight. In fact, the Hawaiian Airlines was the first scheduled air cargo carrier of all the domestic air lines in the country.

Gentlemen, it has not been subsidized by the government. The compensation it received for the carrying of mail in 1945 was less than one-half of one percent of the total gross earnings. I have not the figures for the total percentage with the two domestic lines carrying mail in 1945. But in 1934 it was approximately 21 percent for the domestic lines against one-half of one percent local.

The Hawaiian Airlines is very anxious to increase its mileage, and thereby still further reduce its fares to the local travel. By greater mileage, greater utilization of the organization staff, it brings down your mileage cost. That is what we are anxious to get.

The company has filed applications for service between here and the mainland, and we do believe that an integrated service between here and those islands; that is, between the mainland and Hawaii, tied up with this service here, will give better service to travel, better than any other service that can be worked out. And in this respect this is the same line of argument that the Interior Department at an oral argument in the Hawaiian case gave just a few months ago in Washington.

That, gentlemen, in brief, is the story. That, in general is a summary of the high spots of my brief in the matter of shipping and air transportation in these islands.

Chairman DELANEY. Are there any questions?

Representative TAYLOR. Who determines what the freight and passenger tariff shall be?

Mr. KENNEDY. The Civil Aeronautics Board determines that. That is the Federal agency that determines rates, charter, and practices generally.

Representative TAYLOR. And they also, I assume, look after the safety feature of air transportation?

Mr. KENNEDY. We operate under the same regulations that every certificated air carrier does on the mainland.

Chairman DELANEY. Is there anything else? Any other questions?

That's all, Mr. Kennedy, thank you.

(Mr. Kennedy at this time was excused and withdrew.)

Delegate FARRINGTON. A suggestion was made the other day by Chairman Larcade that the record of the utilities should be rounded out for the purpose of this proceeding. In keeping with that, I have been informed that the Matson Navigation Co. has a statement that it would like to present for the record, my understanding being that the representative will merely want this incorporated in the record, and does not desire to appear. Is that correct?

Chairman DELANEY. He would like it submitted for the record. Would you like to have the statement in the record concerning the operation of the Matson Navigation Co.?

Representative MILLER. I move we accept it.

Chairman DELANEY. Without objection it may be so ordered. (Statement No. 22.)

Delegate FARRINGTON. In keeping with that request, the Public Utilities Commissioner has made himself available for any questions that the committee would like to ask. He may have a prepared statement. I saw him here this afternoon. I don't know whether he is still here. Is the gentleman here?

Chairman DELANEY. Is the Public Utilities Commissioner represented here?

Mr. WOODILL (Public Utilities Commission). He will return very shortly.

Chairman DELANEY. He has a prepared statement?

Mr. WOODILL. Yes. He has. It was filed, I believe, through the Equal Rights Commission.

Chairman DELANEY. Has it been filed?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Libbey's statement has been filed. [See Statement No. 10.]

Delegate FARRINGTON. That covers the point raised by Mr. Larcade.

Chairman DELANEY. Is there anything else? What about tonight's session?

We will recess at the present time until 8 p. m., if anyone desires to be heard at that time they may present themselves here. We now stand adjourned until 8 o'clock this evening.

(Adjourned to 8 p. m., January 15, 1946.)

EVENING SESSION

The hearing was called to order by Chairman Larcade at 8:15 p. m.

Chairman LARCADE. The meeting will come to order. The committee is very glad to see such a numerous outpouring of the citizens of this community to appear here at this time. It shows their intense interest in such problems that are being considered by the committee.

But there are so many present that it is hard to determine just how to proceed, and I would like to suggest at this time that, in order to determine how to proceed, we have some kind of a poll or indication from those present as to how many of those present desire to testify and on what side they desire to testify. So, in order that we may determine how to apportion the time for those who desire to appear, I would request that all of those present who desire to testify in favor of Statehood raise their hands. There are one, two, three, four, five, six, seven.

Delegate FARRINGTON. There are some in the back of the audience.

Chairman LARCADE. There are eight. And in addition to that, they should come forward and give their names to the general counsel so that they may be called in some orderly fashion. All of those who desire to testify in favor of statehood, we will appreciate if they will give their names to the general counsel so that they may be called in an orderly fashion.

While we are waiting for those who desire to testify in favor of statehood, I wish to say that this meeting has been called due to the requests we have had from a number of people who weren't able to appear before the committee during the daytime hearings, and this has been declared as an extra special session in order to give those people who were unable to appear during the day sessions an opportunity to testify for or against the most important question which is presently before this committee, and that is the question of statehood.

Is there anyone else who desires to appear before the committee to testify in favor of statehood? We have here eight citizens who have signified their desire to testify in favor of statehood.

I will now call upon those who wish to testify in opposition of the question of statehood to raise their hands. Well, that looks good for statehood. We have only got four hands against eight. However, of course the committee is impartial in this question, and we only are here to obtain the facts and the testimony of the people on this question. And I know ask all of those who have signified their intention to appear in opposition to statehood to likewise give their names to the general counsel so that we may call them in order.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, this committee has announced on a number of occasions that they desire to give anyone an opportunity to appear either for or in opposition to this question, and, as we are going to apportion the time for this hearing on the basis of the number that have signified their intention to appear for or against statehood, before we undertake the hearing we want to ask again if there is anyone who desires to appear before the committee. If there is, we would be glad to have them signify their intention at this time.

May I ask if Senator Alice Kamokila Campbell is present?

Senator CAMPBELL. Yes.

Chairman LARCADE. Madam, you have been invited to appear before this committee. Would you desire to appear at this time?

Senator CAMPBELL. No, I haven't got my facts in order to speak this evening. I am sorry.

Chairman LARCADE. Well, the committee desires to give you every opportunity to appear during these hearings, and, as we have announced publicly at 2 o'clock this afternoon, we desire to have you

appear if you so desire, and we would appreciate your indicating whether or not you are going to appear, and if so, when?

Senator CAMPBELL. Well, I had planned to speak on Thursday at 10 o'clock and I have some charts being made, and I have to gather a little more data, and I will have that in order by tomorrow noon. And it would be impossible for me to speak tonight.

Chairman LARCADE. Well, under the circumstances if it is impossible for you to appear at this time, the committee has indicated its willingness to give you a special opportunity on Thursday, and has announced that they will meet at 10 o'clock on Thursday, at which time they will be very glad to have you appear before this committee.

Senator CAMPBELL. Thank you very much.

Chairman LARCADE. Well, now, we will proceed with the hearing and we will hear the first witness. Delegate Farrington has a suggestion with respect to the procedure. We have 13 people who have indicated their desire to testify, and we have concluded to allow each one of the witnesses 5 minutes each and have the proponent and opponent appearing in alternate positions. We will first call upon a witness who is opposed to statehood, and then one who is in favor, and they will alternate in the order that they have signified their intentions to testify. And we have decided to allocate 5 minutes to each witness. In the event that that time is not sufficient for a witness to cover his or her testimony, in keeping with the announced procedure of the committee it will be in order for anyone who testifies—as a matter of fact, anyone present who does not testify and desires to—to file with the committee a brief or a statement either for or against statehood. However, I want to call your attention to the fact that no statement or brief will be accepted from anonymous sources. Anyone desiring to file a statement or brief on this question will have to sign his name to the document. Otherwise, it cannot be received.

We will, therefore, under that agreement proceed and we will call the first witness, who is Netta Alameda. May I ask, Miss, that you give to the stenographer your name and business or organization which you represent? And may I ask that you sit opposite the microphone so that the audience may hear what you say?

Miss ALAMEDA. I am Netta Alameda, 15 years of age, a sophomore at Punahou. I am of Portuguese-English-Hawaiian-Chinese ancestry. I was born here and intend to continue living here after I finish my education. I am not representing anybody but myself as an individual. I am very much against statehood for Hawaii immediately. I do not believe that Hawaii is ready for it yet. Maybe in 10 to 25 years it will be ready.

My chief reason is that the majority of the racial groups holds the power here in Hawaii. They are Americans of Japanese ancestry. I do not wish to make any racial discriminations and would have made the same statement regardless of the racial group that held a controlling number of people.

Many do not realize what great power Japanese have. They are the leading producers of food in the islands. This is one of the most important factors in the survival of the people of the Territory.

In the last election there were over 70,000 eligible Japanese voters. Only 27,000 registered. This is definitely a very low percentage. In a State this would not be accepted.

It is true that the AJA's did do a wonderful job fighting in Italy. But that was their duty as American citizens. Any other American would have done the same thing.

The generation of Japanese students that are now in school here are the group that realize their duty as Americans. They will be the people who will hold some of the public offices in the future. They are being educated for it now. They will be the ones who will benefit by statehood. I say, wait until then when we have more people who are prepared for it. The Japanese are not all thoroughly Americanized, not all speak English, and not all of them are true Americans.

Will statehood for Hawaii really be worth the work of reorganizing the laws of the Territory, establishing interstate commerce laws, et cetera? Hawaii has been a successful Territory. Why should we change now and become a State?

The mainland is not yet ready to recognize Hawaii's representatives because of the racial prejudice. That is evident more there than it is here. Here we are very equal with our fellow members. Then, also, we have the Big Five who seem to have the controlling power here. They have a great deal of influence over their employees. That is evident on Maui where I lived for quite awhile, where the Baldwins had control of their people, and the Republicans held public office for 40 years until the past few years when they were upset.

I do not wish to make any distinguishing remarks between the racial groups, but it is true that the largest group always holds the upper hand.

Chairman LARCADE. Thank you. Just a minute, Miss. One of the members of the committee desires to ask you some questions.

Representative MILLER. What did you say your racial background was?

Miss ALAMEDA. Portuguese-English-Chinese-Hawaiian.

Representative MILLER. Well, I am Irish-Italian. It wasn't so many years ago that my ancestors were looked upon as inferior people. It wasn't so many ago that the Portuguese in California, who have made great contributions to our wealth and our economy, were not accepted. Don't you think that the way to effectuate Americanism is to tackle this thing now? You and I have a lot in common. You are apparently pretty much interested in the Democratic Party. I am a Democrat. [Laughter and applause.] I am tickled to death that you licked the Republicans on Maui, and I wish you success. But don't you think that you are running away from it? You are a very intelligent girl and I want to congratulate you upon that statement, but don't you think you are running away from issues that have to be met?

There is no reason why you or your ancestors, or I and my ancestors, should not maintain our place in this community. Sure, the Italians on the Pacific coast are accepted now. One of our boys runs the biggest bank in the United States, the Bank of America, Mr. Gianini. The Irish do a pretty good job in dominating politics there and are accepted. But don't you think that you are running away from issues in your statement here, issues that you know at heart are the things you stand for, as you were just saying? Aren't you running away from issues and saying, Well, I don't want to meet them, I want to put them off for awhile? Aren't you doing that?

MISS AMEDA. Well, as I said, the students that are now in school are being prepared for it, and they know what they are doing and they will probably do a very good job when they have completed their education.

Representative MILLER. How old are you?

MISS ALAMEDA. Fifteen.

Representative MILLER. Fifteen. It seems a long way off. By the time these students come along, it will be merely a minor time, a second, in the history of the country. You go back and you study your thesis and see if you don't think it is more courageous to meet this thing head-on. As far as the Big Five are concerned, the people of Hawaii are demonstrating that they can take care of that issue, if it is an issue. Personally, I think it is something that is a little bit overrated. If it were an issue, the charges that we make against them could be sustained, could have been sustained 20 years ago, even 10 years ago. But I think the economic pressure will take care of that.

Take my advice and don't worry about it, but don't run away from issues that you know in your heart are right, and you study them. [Applause.]

Chairman LARCADE. Ladies and gentlemen, at this time we will ask Colonel Clarke to appear before this committee. Will you kindly give your name and business and a short sketch of your background?

TESTIMONY OF COL. ADNA G. CLARKE

Colonel CLARKE. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is Adna G. Clarke. I am a Colonel, retired, United States Army; an emeritus professor of police administration at the University of Hawaii. I am employed at the present time by the Punahou School. When I asked Dr. Fox what I should say was my job, he said "principal trouble-shooter for the president."

Delegate FARRINGTON. Colonel Clarke, will you state for the record if you are 21, a registered citizen of the Territory, and a registered voter? We want to know if you are a citizen and how long you have resided here.

Colonel CLARKE. May I call attention to the fact, Mr. Delegate, that at the two previous appearances before the committee my whole life was set out in particular detail, and if I have only 5 minutes I would like to— [Laughter.]

Well, I was born in Missouri and I was raised in Kansas. I have two degrees from the University of Kansas. I am a member of the bar of the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas. I was clerk of the court in the State of Kansas. And I commanded a company of infantry under Fred Funston in the Spanish-American War. When I came back and tried to stay out for a couple of years, the fever was too strong and I applied for and received a commission as a first lieutenant of artillery in the Regular Army. I continued through the grade of colonel until I was retired for wounds received in action in the Spanish-American War, but not until 1925—1920, rather—when I was immediately put on active duty with the University of Hawaii and three other high school units of the ROTC.

Delegate FARRINGTON. Well, you have covered everything except the question that I asked, and that is, were you a resident and a registered voter of the Territory?

Colonel CLARKE. I am. [Laughter.]

Delegate FARRINGTON. Thank you.

Chairman LARCADE. Colonel, I think your recital qualified you to testify on this question. You may proceed.

Colonel CLARKE. I appeared as an advocate of statehood for Hawaii at both the 1935 and the 1937 hearings. I desire to reiterate what I said at those hearings and I would be glad to have this committee consider all that I said at those hearings.

During the 1937 hearing I made this significant statement, on page 281:

From 1923 to 1932, while professor of military science and tactics at the University of Hawaii, I recommended for, and the President of the United States commissioned more than 60 young Americans of Oriental ancestry in the Reserve Corps of the United States Army, and, as I said during the hearing 2 years ago, I certainly would not have recommended them had I had the slightest doubt of their loyalty. I give it as my carefully considered belief that, in the event of war, even with the country of their ancestry, as large a percent of Americans of oriental ancestry would as willingly and ably bear arms in defense of American democracy as did Americans of other ancestry in the World War; and I make this statement having in mind the casualty lists and lists of those decorated for gallantry in action in at least one noble shock division in which the names of those of Teutonic ancestry equalled or exceeded that of any other racial descent.

To me it is axiomatic that confidence breeds loyalty, that suspicion breeds disloyalty, and that one of the greatest military assets of any country in time of war is a loyal citizenry.

Few men have ever had their beliefs so quickly and so completely vindicated. Hawaii's own Two Hundred and Ninety-eighth and Two Hundred and Ninety-ninth Infantry National Guard regiments from which stemmed the far-famed One Hundredth Infantry Battalion; the almost equally decorated Four Hundred and Forty-second combat team; as well as the thousands of other soldiers of Hawaii fighting on every battle front has settled once and for all the question of the loyalty to American ideals and institutions of the men of Hawaii without regard to race.

To illustrate the ability of the youths of Hawaii to fight as a team in time of peace as they did later in time of war, without regard to ancestry, I present to the committee this picture of the 1926 University of Hawaii ROTC team that trained at Camp Lewis, Wash., in the summer of 1926. [Indicating large picture on table.] This team, composed of 26 Americans—9 Caucasians, 9 Hawaiians and part-Hawaiians, 5 Japanese, and 3 Chinese—competed with 500 of the picked students of the 21 great educational institutions west of the Rocky Mountains for 10 medals and 8 trophies, in every type of military and in athletic events and won 10 medals and 7 trophies and tied for the eighth.

Similar teams from the University of Hawaii in competition with all the ROTC Infantry units of the United States for the "Warrior of the Pacific," the National Infantry ROTC rifle team trophy [seen in the picture on the ground in front of Cadet Captain Wise] won it 16 out of the 17 years it was in competition, 1925-41.

From December 7 to 13, 1941, I accepted the provisional command of several hundred veterans who responded to the following radio broadcast over both KGU and KGMB at 11:10 a. m. December 7:

All American Legionnaires report at American Legion club house, Kapiolani and McCully, immediately.

This message was filed by Lieutenant Liu, police department.

I present herewith certain documentary evidence of what occurred under my immediate observation showing completely the loyalty, without regard to racial ancestry, of the World War Veterans and others in Hawaii:

Exhibit 72 A Activities of all American Legion posts.

Exhibit 72 B Special report on Midway Island Post.

Exhibit 72 C Composition mission and accomplishment of the explosive detail.

Exhibit 72 D Typical hospital guard detail.

Exhibit 72 E Diaries of 23 boys of Troop No. 36, Boy Scouts of America, sponsored by Hon. Post, No. 1.

[Handing a number of documents to the committee.]

During the 1937 hearing I expressed the hope that the members of the Commission would visit the War Memorial Natatorium at Waikiki, erected by the taxpayers of Hawaii, and while there note the cosmopolitan character of the names on Hawaii's roll of honor. May I express the hope that the members of this committee do likewise, and that they also visit the War Memorial temporary shaft across King Street near here and note the similar roll of honor of World War II?

In closing may I call your attention to a prayer, Let There Be Peace, written by Jane Comstock, the poet, my sweetheart since the days when Charley Curtis, Arthur Capper, Bill Rogers, and Will White were just beginning to make history in Kansas and Oklahoma:

God of all peoples, let Thy smiles
Bring peace to these, Thy palm-girt isles
Whatever of race, or of color, we be,
Ebony, gold, or of ivory;
Mosaic of nations: a masterpiece
Not dreamed of by artists of Rome or Greece;
Mosaic of Souls of the human race,
Thou hast fashioned, Lord, for thine altarplace.

Chairman LARCADE. Just a minute, Colonel. The members of the Committee would like to interrogate you, if you will permit it.

Representative MILLER. I'd like to know what that button is that you have in the lapel of your coat?

Colonel CLARKE. The past commander of the American Legion.

Delegate FARRINGTON. Colonel Clarke, isn't this true—and I ask this for the record, as most of the people of Hawaii know that it is true—that for many years you were in charge of one ROTC unit or another at the high schools and at the University of Hawaii, and that many of the men of many racial distinctions who distinguished themselves during the World War received their early training in military science and in citizenship from yourself?

Colonel CLARKE. Not less than a thousand.

Delegate FARRINGTON. And it is a great source of pride to you to know that the confidence that you had expressed to them has been so highly vindicated?

Colonel CLARKE. Most naturally.

Delegate FARRINGTON. And I want to say that I know that I express the sentiment of the people of the Territory when I say that they appreciate very deeply the great service that you have rendered to our people in Hawaii.

Chairman LARCARDE. I want to join with the Delegate from Alaska—[Laughter]—Hawaii, in saying—I will ask the audience to pardon me because I have just recently presided at meetings in Alaska and I get Alaska and Hawaii confused. I could make a statement in that connection at this time but I think I might show partiality if I did, and probably it might be better if I did not make any further statement beyond that. But I want to say, Colonel, that since I have learned of your record in this Territory, I am sure that I can join with the Delegate in saying that you certainly must be justly proud of that record, and the people of this Territory should certainly appreciate your efforts in that behalf. And we thank you for having appeared before this committee.

Colonel CLARKE. Thank you. [Applause.]

Chairman LARCARDE. The next witness listed with the committee is John C. Jacobs. Will Mr. Jacobs come forward? Will you give your connections or business?

Mr. JACOBS. I am now working for the Navy supply center. The name has been changed from depot to center. I'm in charge of the paint shop in building 8, Salt Lake. Do you want to know the previous connection?

Chairman LARCARDE. Yes, I'd like to, for the benefit of the committee so as to evaluate your testimony, sir; and it is customary to give a short sketch of your background. Were you born in Hawaii?

Mr. JACOBS. Take it easy, pal. [Laughter.] I was born in New York State, Syracuse, N. Y., and have been a resident of Rochester for a good many years. I've been a superintendent of Stewart & Brenner for 20 years, building contractors, for many years. I'm now on the gripe committee, one of the five representatives on the gripe committee, trying to make better relations between the Navy and the civilian personnel.

Chairman LARCARDE. What committee do you refer to, sir?

Mr. JACOBS. The gripe committee.

Chairman LARCARDE. What organization does that comprise?

Mr. JACOBS. Well, the complaints and all that sort of thing that comes up.

Chairman LARCARDE. Of the workers in the Navy?

Mr. JACOBS. That's right.

Chairman LARCARDE. What is the number?

Mr. JACOBS. Of the workers?

Chairman LARCARDE. Yes.

Mr. JACOBS. Well, they fluctuated. We asked for that. I think at the present time that the Navy employs 6,000. There must be about 14,000 workers.

Chairman LARCARDE. Have you been delegated by this group to represent them here on this occasion?

Mr. JACOBS. Well, yes.

Chairman LARCARDE. By resolution or meeting?

Mr. JACOBS. That's right.

Chairman LARCARDE. Or otherwise?

Mr. JACOBS. That's right, by the president of the All-States Club. Right away I want to register a protest. I'm against statehood for Hawaii and for the same reason that you want it. We are misrepresented, no representation at all. Tonight two representatives from

New York are not here. What right have they got to take the place of the sick, lame, and lazy? That's a fair question.

Chairman LARCADE. Well, wait a minute, I'll answer that in justice to the two gentlemen that are absent. [Laughter.] The committee is going to command that we have order. Prior to the time that it was announced that there was going to be a meeting here tonight, they made previous engagements, sir, and for that reason they are not present. You can't criticize them because I want to say that this has been the most loyal and faithful committee that I have ever been on in any investigation or hearing from the Congress of the United States. These men have been here daily for the last 10 days, from 9 o'clock, from 10 o'clock in the morning until 4 o'clock in the evening, and never before has any member of this committee missed a session, and they have remained throughout the sessions. And in view of the fact that these men had previous engagements, they asked to be excused. And in view of their attendance, the chairman could not do otherwise but grant them a leave on this occasion.

However, whatever you have to say, or whatever anyone else has to say on this occasion, will be recorded in the record and will be presented to the Congress of the United States just the same as if those two men were present.

Mr. JACOBS. That's O. K. [Laughter.] There's a personal letter from the New York State Club to him tonight. We tried to reach Mr. Delaney several times; we've sent many letters. That's why we are kicking. No representation. There was 100,000 civilians sent over here in Navy work, civilian workers. No representation. No one listened to their gripes. In fact, I, as president of the New York State Club, hold no gripe against anybody on the whole eight islands. Get that straight. Japanese, Chinese, or any of them. Our laws of New York State are the same as your laws in Hawaii. And the New York State Club, we've got a Negro secretary, and if anybody asked me my opinion I'd say he was the best man in the club.

Now, my main gripe on this island here is discrimination. In the first place, we want to see our boys in the hospital and all that sort of thing. I also represent certain Masonic lodges, certain Odd Fellows lodges; I represent the American Federation of Labor. We've got a set-up on the mainland to take care of our sick and our lame and our lazy. There's no facilities here that gives us access, free access, to these buildings. We are constantly discriminated against.

Chairman LARCADE. Whom do you mean when you say "we"?

Mr. JACOBS. Why, the civilians in the Navy housing areas. Coming down here tonight the bus would go right piling by, just by you, unconcerned as if you never existed, and they've done that for the whole 14 months. [Laughter.]

Chairman LARCADE. Well, I might make an observation at this point, sir, that the same condition exists all over the mainland. I live in Washington, D. C., and my wife has to hustle along with the rest of the crowd to get a seat or get standing room in a bus to go from her apartment to get something to eat uptown just like the rest of the people.

Mr. JACOBS. Did you ever work for 14 months in one place, in Salt Lake, that the bus continually went by you? [Laughter.]

Chairman LARCADE. Was the bus filled?

Mr. JACOBS. Some of them were and some of them weren't.

Chairman LARCADE. Well, that's a matter that comes under the regulations of the local authority, and it's something that this committee has nothing to do with. We are here to have testimony on statehood.

Mr. JACOBS. That's why I say you are deficient, you're not qualified for it until you rectify these things.

Chairman LARCADE. That's a matter of opinion.

Mr. JACOBS. That's why I'm expressing my opinion, and I hope—
[Laughter.]

Chairman LARCADE. The Chairman will have to ask that the audience keep order. We want to hear this gentleman and give him every opportunity to testify, but we must have order. You may proceed, sir.

Mr. JACOBS. Now, a lot of us civilians came over here, and there's quite a lot of us that you advertised to extensively that it's a paradise of the Pacific. A lot of us contemplate making our homes here. But under the circumstances what are we to think? We've got to take things as we see them. Take, for instance, the press. On New Year's Day, when there should be peace on earth, good will to men, what did the morning paper print? A mother deserts her family with children and the father alone. The children are dirty, they're hungry and alone, like waifs from the slums in New York. And what have the waifs got to do with this? The Wednesday next to New Year's, the New York Club had one hand in their pocket and the other in the air, one protesting, the other trying to do something for that family.

If you want some aid, why don't you come up to these clubs, sir, and we'll cooperate with you. That's our main basis. It's discrimination. And I want to make it just as effective as I can. I don't think you are at the present time qualified for statehood, and that's the reason, that there's a lot of these niceties of life you should learn. And when we came over here from the mainland, we were called suckers. And there's no word in the English language that describes us more fittingly than that same word "sucker." [Laughter.]

Now, Hawaii certainly should have had a more friendly attitude toward us. One hundred thousand people—you certainly missed a lot. You could have made us feel at home. Maybe the mainlander didn't move by intelligence, but his feelings were hurt. And if you do look for an extension, you've got to look for an extension; you've got to take a lot of these things under consideration. They considered us from the mainland as just suckers, but our money is good. I know, I notice you grab it, brother; you grab it just as well as any place on this civilized world.

Now, I won't take up any more of your time. I want that registered, and Delaney will hear from that. I called up Delaney on the phone and I told him that I represent a club at the same time. Our clubs on the mainland, Pearl Harbor Clubs of the different States, we'll put one in Queens. The clubs are principally in New York State. We'll put one right in Queens where Delaney is, and we'll put one in central New York. I thank you.

Chairman LARCADE. I want to call the attention of the witness that the gentleman from New York, Mr. Delaney, has arrived and is present now. [Laughter.]

Mr. JACOBS. That's very good. I'm glad he's here.

Chairman LARCADE. I want to say further that he is fully able to take care of himself and his constituents in his district. Well, we thank you for appearing.

Representative DELANEY. Just one second. [Laughter.] I understand this hearing is on statehood. Did you come here to testify in behalf of the statehood or opposed to it, or did you come here to criticize some of the Congressmen?

Mr. JACOBS. Well, my criticism is a lack of representation. With 100,000 of us from the mainland here, and no one gives a hunk about us—

Representative DELANEY. Never mind "us." Where do you come from?

Mr. JACOBS. New York State.

Representative DELANEY. Where do you come from?

Mr. JACOBS. Rochester.

Representative DELANEY. And who is your Congressman?

Mr. JACOBS. We've got a lot of Congressmen. O'Brien is one of them. You know who he is.

Representative DELANEY. Well, I don't know; that's why I'm asking.

Mr. JACOBS. Well, we have O'Brien, same religion and nationality as you are. [Laughter.]

Representative DELANEY. This gentleman seems to know more about me than I do about myself.

Mr. JACOBS. Well, our kick is that we lack representation. That's our main kick against statehood.

Representative DELANEY. When you say "we," whom do you mean?

Mr. JACOBS. Well, we in the New York State Club, which is a pretty powerful club in the area, we went over this situation carefully. We wrote you letters. We never got a reply. And we don't like that.

Representative DELANEY. When you say "We wrote you letters," whom do you mean?

Mr. JACOBS. The New York State Club of Pearl Harbor.

Representative DELANEY. Well, I for one have never received a letter from you.

Mr. JACOBS. Well, that's one of the other gripes. Our men don't get mail. That's the trouble. [Laughter.]

Chairman LARCADE. We'll have to have order, ladies and gentlemen.

Representative DELANEY. Are you for or against statehood?

Mr. JACOBS. Well, I'm against statehood.

Representative DELANEY. And I suppose you are familiar with all the problems that they have here in the islands?

Mr. JACOBS. Brother, there never was a fellow that danced around these islands better than I have in the 14 months here, from the churches, both Catholic and Protestant, to the Republican Club and Labor Canteen, and I took part in taking care of your wounded. I visited all the hospitals. I was over at the Princess' Palace several times. I hope you gentlemen are invited there. [Laughter.] And I expect to go there again.

Representative DELANEY. You came here to make a living, is that right?

Mr. JACOBS. Well, not necessarily. I came here to look for a place where it's warm, principally in the winter. My State is the leading State in the world, brother. Rochester leads the world in living in-

dustry. It needs no introduction. We've got two religions, the Mormon and the Spiritual. We got up women suffrage.

Representative DELANEY. How long have you been in the islands?

Mr. JACOBS. Fourteen months.

Representative DELANEY. If you didn't come here to work, what means of transportation was granted to you?

Mr. JACOBS. What means of transportation? I'm kicking on the means of transportation. That's one of the gripes here. [Laughter.] It's the lack of transportation.

Representative DELANEY. How were you transported from the mainland over here to the islands?

Mr. JACOBS. Well, I came from New York on—let's see, I started on the New York Central, then I went on the Pennsylvania, then I went on the Erie, then I went on the Central Pacific, and North Pacific, Northern Pacific, and Southern Pacific, and I wasn't bragging of the boat I came over on.

Representative DELANEY. And you came over here to go to work, did you?

Mr. JACOBS. That's right, and I did.

Representative DELANEY. And that's the means that you used to get over to these islands?

Mr. JACOBS. What do you mean "the means?"

Representative DELANEY. If you came here just as a visitor or just as a vacationist, you wouldn't be granted passage to these islands?

Mr. JACOBS. That's right; my business agent sent me over here. He asked me to come over here because there was a critical shortage of men, which wasn't true.

Representative DELANEY. So you're criticizing your business agent?

Mr. JACOBS. No; he didn't know that. He wasn't informed on that. [Laughter.]

Chairman LARCADE. Any other questions by members of the committee? (No response.) We thank you for your appearance, Mr. Jacobs. [Applause.]

(Witness excused.)

Chairman LARCADE. The next witness invited to appear before the committee is Mr. Thomas Maunupau. State your business and a brief outline of your background.

Mr. MAUNUPAU. It's all in here. [Referring to a document.] My name is Thomas K. Maunupau, residing at 3326 Honolulu Street Honolulu, T. H.; born in Kaulupulehu, in the district of North Kona, island of Hawaii; educated in the public school of my native Kona and finished my high school education at St. Louis College of this city. Married and have 11 children living; and 2 of my boys are in the United States Army. Of course, I am an American of Hawaiian ancestry.

Since October 1, 1913, I have been employed as a Hawaiian translator of legal documents in the Territory, bureau of conveyances. My present position now is translator and abstractor of land titles in the city bureau.

Last week five members of the Maunupau family, all voters, took a vote on the question of statehood. The results showed: For statehood, 5; against, 0.

This is a picture of the state of mind of the majority of the people of Hawaii on the question of statehood. Therefore, I am here for myself and for the rest of the Maunupau family. The members of the Maunupau family are definitely in favor of statehood because Hawaii, like a child, has grown from a minor to a matured person desiring nothing less than full enjoyment as an American citizen capable to manage his own affairs.

I have some more but I'm going to keep that.

Chairman LARCADE. Take your time. We want to give everybody a full opportunity to express themselves.

Mr. MAUNUPAU. Let us turn back a few pages of Hawaiian history. Take the reign of the Hawaiian Kingdom from the time of Kamehameha I when he conquered the island of Hawaii in 1795 to and including the overthrow of Queen Liliuokalani in January 17, 1893, we note several changes in the Hawaiian Government brought about for a more liberal and representative government.

For instance, in 1839, King Kamehameha III and the chiefs adopted a declaration of rights which was followed a year later by the first written constitution. The intent and spirit of the ruler may best be seen in the following quotation from the document which says in part that:

In making laws for a nation it is by no means proper to enact laws for the protection of rulers only, without also providing protection for their subjects; neither is it proper to enact laws to enrich the chiefs only, without regard to the enriching of their subjects also. Protection is hereby secured to the persons of all the people together with their lands and all their property, and nothing whatever shall be taken from any individual, except by express provision of the laws.

The first legislature in the Kingdom to include elected representatives of the people was convened by the King on May 20, 1845. Executive branches of the Government were formed, civil and criminal codes of law established in the manner of western nations and in 1852, a new and liberal constitution was granted by which the people were given the opportunity to share in the administration of the nation's government affairs. Hawaii passed its probationary period as the Republic of Hawaii and later as a Territory. It was during the reign of King Kamehameha III that the Great Mahele came into existence in 1848.

And now I am going to express my views on bloc voting. I have no fear of bloc voting by Americans of Japanese ancestry or for that matter any other racial extractions. By bloc voting, I mean the consistent and extensive use thereof by the Japanese throughout the islands to the disadvantage of the other racial groups.

Those who fear the Americans of Japanese ancestry forget the sincerity and loyalty of those citizens; for the love of their country they gave their all. Their loyalty to the United States has been written in sacrifice and blood.

They do not even credit these good citizens with some intelligence and sense of fair play and sportsmanship.

They do not take into consideration the following factors: (1) The power of the press, (2) public opinion, (3) three party system (Democrat, Labor, and Republican).

I lived among them in Kona, went to school with them, work on the plantation with them, take part in sports with them, and during

the war I was a chief precinct warden of precinct 31, section 11, zone 3, and found them to be good as any citizen in these islands.

When Hawaii became a Territory the political parties then in existence were the Home Rule Party comprised mostly of Hawaiians, the Republican, the Democrat and Independence comprising of haoles, Hawaiians, and other racial groups. The home-rulers elected Robert W. Wilcox as the first Delegate to Congress. The following election, Prince Kalanianaʻole Kūhiō ran on the Republican ticket and was elected and he served Hawaii for many years until his death. By the introduction of the party system the Hawaiians split up and voted as Democrats and Republicans, as all Americans do. The other racial groups will do likewise. As a matter of fact, they have been doing that these many years.

Some years someone said "nana i ka ili"—"look for the skin of your own," and the press and public opinion went to bat and batted the thing out of the political field.

As to the land monopoly in Hawaii, under the system of land tenure in early Hawaii, which was feudalistic, the title to the whole of the land was in the King. There was no such thing as fee simple title. King Kamehameha I, who conquered the whole, partitioned the lands among his warrior chiefs, retaining a certain revenue from them. These chiefs did the same to those under them by parcelling out the arable portions among the common people living on their lands, the tenants in turn rendering various services besides cultivating certain parcels of land which they maintained as guardians for their landlords.

With the advent of foreigners and foreign business methods, however, it became apparent that a change in the system of land tenure would have to be made, so, in the early 1840's land tenure in Hawaii entered a transitional period terminating in the "Great Mahele" of 1848, which furnished the facility for acquirement of real estate in fee simple.

This was made possible by the King (Kauikeaouli, King Kamehameha III), who, to his everlasting honor, voluntarily waived and gave up for the common good, all his right to the whole of the lands in Hawaii that it might be, and which was ultimately divided into three parts—one to the chiefs, one for the support of the government, and a third for the King's personal use. These we know by the names of "Konohiki", Government", and "Crown lands".

I am going to mention racial discrimination. There is no such animal. [Laughter.] In 1925 the local legislature appropriated money and created the Hawaiian Folk Lore Commission for the purpose of collecting and preserving the Hawaiian chants and melodies and songs. I was selected as the interpreter, and with Miss Helen Roberts of the Bishop Museum, we went from island to island. We entered Kona and we made our headquarters in Kealahou. One day we hired a car and a Hawaiian driver and we went to Kailua Beach down by the sea. And when we got out I told this Hawaiian that he should come back and pick us up at 12 noon. Before 12 we were there waiting for this Hawaiian. He did not show up. It was half past 12, and still he did not show up. Miss Roberts was pacing nervously up and down the road and saying, "What is the matter with these Hawaiians?" It was 1 o'clock and still no one was in

sight; half past 1 and he never showed up; 2 o'clock and he never showed up. [Laughter.] And then she said to me, "Why, the Hawaiians do not value the time; no wonder they are not progressive." I did not say anything because I had a very poor case. Later on we called for a taxi, and the Japanese taxi man came and picked us up, and finally a couple of days after we landed in Hilo, one evening she brought up the question again, and then I looked her squarely in the face and I said, "Well, I think the Hawaiian people are the greatest business people in the world." She looked at me and she said, "You go to Honolulu and walk along King Street and Fort Street and other streets, and you don't find any Hawaiian establishments, any stores of any kind. You come to Maui and it is the same thing. And on the big island it is the same thing." And I said, "It all depends on what you mean by business. If you mean by business dollars and cents, the Hawaiians are not there. But if by business you mean the art of living, the art of getting to the other people nicely and in a nice way, I think the Hawaiians have contributed something worth while, something to think about."

In conclusion, Hawaii has its faults. What State has no faults? Even our own United States, with all the faults that it has, is still the greatest country known to man.

Gentlemen, I hope you take this message from the people of Hawaii and consider our case, that it is just common sense and justice that we appeal to you Congressmen of our great country to go back and then present our case and consider it, and we leave our case to the honor and justice and fair play of the American people. I thank you. [Applause.]

Chairman LARCADE. Any questions by members of the committee?

Representative ANGELL. No questions.

Chairman LARCADE. Delegate Farrington?

Delegate FARRINGTON. I don't think the witness made quite clear in the early statement just how the vote was cast in the Maunupau family. How did you consider the question of statehood when the vote was cast? Did you vote in favor of statehood for Hawaii?

Mr. MAUNUPAU. Yes; there was a question of for and against, and we just cast our ballot in the American way. We said, vote as you please. I think I'd even ask them on what parties they are running and how they are voting. [Laughter.] But when the results showed up, they were five to nothing. And this is a real story. I don't want to tell you a lie, gentlemen. If I do, I will tell it to my wife.

Representative DELANEY. Who was the tally clerk? [Laughter.]

Mr. MAUNUPAU. My oldest daughter, who is married.

Representative MILLER. I think it is an excellent statement. I have no question.

Chairman LARCADE. I agree with you. Thank you very much for appearing before the committee.

Mr. MAUNUPAU. You are welcome. [Applause.]

Chairman LARCADE. The next witness on the side of the opponents is Robert England. Mr. England, will you give your name and business and a short background of yourself?

Mr. ENGLAND. Robert England. I am president of the All States Club of Pearl Harbor. This club is composed of all officer or former

officers of the various State clubs in the Fourteenth Naval District. We are located down at Area No. 3, CHA-3.

Chairman LARCADE. Pardon me for interrupting you, but are you authorized by resolution or meeting to appear as a representative of that organization?

Mr. ENGLAND. Yes, sir. We have been working on the Territorial tax practically since the infancy of the All States Club. I was Democratic county committeeman from Milwaukee County for two terms, and I resigned to come over here and work for the navy yard, in reply to the urgent need for men. We from the mainland, the civilian workers in the Fourteenth Naval District, feel that when the Territory tries to compel us to pay a Territorial 2 percent gross income tax on a salary that is derived entirely from the United States Government—we live entirely in a naval reservation—that we do not receive any benefit from the Territory or from the country or city. [See Statement No. 31.]

Chairman LARCADE. Pardon me for interrupting you again. Do you appear as a witness on the question of statehood, or did you come before the committee to explain about the local situation?

Mr. ENGLAND. No; I came against statehood. I am representing this body of men, and we are against statehood for the reason that we have been taxed without representation. That is the one thing that Hawaii is asking for—statehood. We feel that we have the right to make the same complaint, for we have taxation without representation, and the majority of the men have families at home. They are supporting families back on the mainland. We are taxed by our various States. We are told that, regardless of where we are, we are still liable for our State tax, and we feel that it is very unfair of the Territory to ask us to pay taxes when we are compelled to pay taxes back in our various States. That is the main reason that the civilian workers are against statehood for Hawaii. They are registering their protest in that way.

Chairman LARCADE. How long have you lived here?

Mr. ENGLAND. Just a year.

Chairman LARCADE. Do you have anything further to say?

Mr. ENGLAND. That's all.

Chairman LARCADE. Any questions, Mr. Farrington?

Delegate FARRINGTON. Mr. England, do you plan to return to the States?

Mr. ENGLAND. Yes.

Delegate FARRINGTON. You are not planning to make your residence here?

Mr. ENGLAND. No, sir.

Delegate FARRINGTON. Of course, if you were planning to make your residence here, you'd become a voter and then participate?

Mr. ENGLAND. That's right; another thing is that a man has to be a citizen here 3 years before he can hold any city or county or Territorial position.

Delegate FARRINGTON. Well, you can vote after you have been here a year, isn't that correct?

Mr. ENGLAND. I don't know how that applies to the area. I don't believe that there is any provision made for voting up in Area 3.

Delegate FARRINGTON. Well, I think that if you live in the area, you would be regarded as a resident of the Territory, so long as you are a civilian. I can't speak with final authority on that.

Mr. ENGLAND. Well, I wouldn't speak with any definite authority either, but I don't believe that there has ever been any election booth or anything ever erected up in the area because we are a naval reservation, and in fact I know from what the authorities have said that this Territory cannot even fix a road in there. And for that reason I am stating that the Territory has done absolutely nothing for the civilian from the mainland.

Delegate FARRINGTON. Is it true, Mr. England, that there is quite a difference of opinion among the people of the Territory itself regarding that 2 percent tax?

Mr. ENGLAND. I realize that.

Delegate FARRINGTON. And that there is considerable opposition among the citizens of the Territory?

Mr. ENGLAND. I guess you know that I have been in contact with Andy Bremilles on that.

Delegate FARRINGTON. Well, I am well aware of what has arisen out of that tax and that many of you have communicated with your Congressmen in the States about it.

Mr. ENGLAND. Well, that is the biggest grievance that the civilian workers have. Otherwise, the majority of them like Hawaii and feel, of course, that there are all kinds of kicks. I don't care where you go, you will always find kicks.

Delegate FARRINGTON. This is a pleasant place to live in other than that particular feature, and you and your association with the population is quite a happy one?

Mr. ENGLAND. Yes; as far as the racial discrimination, even though I am not from the South, I am from the North, I was surprised to see everybody get along as well as they do together down there, because we haven't even got it up in the North. I guess that Wisconsin is pretty broad-minded on a lot of things, but it just seems to be a little bit different.

Chairman LARCADE. Congressman Delaney would like to ask a question.

Representative DELANEY. I assume from your testimony that you are from Wisconsin?

Mr. ENGLAND. That's right.

Representative DELANEY. Now, do you claim that the treatment you receive here in the Territory is any different than you would receive in the States?

Mr. ENGLAND. How do you mean that, Mr. Delaney?

Representative DELANEY. Well, let me put a specific example to you. You are from the State of Wisconsin and you go to New York to work.

Mr. ENGLAND. Yes.

Representative DELANEY. Let's suppose that you go to the Brooklyn Navy Yard.

Mr. ENGLAND. That's right.

Representative DELANEY. We have a New York State tax. It runs as high as about 7 percent. If you worked in the Brooklyn Navy

Yard, you would have to pay that New York State tax in addition to your Federal tax.

Mr. ENGLAND. Is that an income tax or a sales tax?

Representative DELANEY. That is an income tax, New York State income tax. Do you claim that New York State is not justified in receiving that tax?

Mr. ENGLAND. I don't believe so. Are you living in the city of New York at the time, or in the State of New York, or on a reservation?

Representative DELANEY. It doesn't make any difference where you live. If you earn money in the State of New York, even though you live in the State of New Jersey, and there are thousands of people there, and they have to pay the tax in the State of New York. Now, do you claim that that is discriminating against outside residents who come into the State?

Mr. ENGLAND. Yes. Wisconsin hasn't got that.

Representative DELANEY. However, Wisconsin doesn't run the unions.

Mr. ENGLAND. That's right. [Laughter.]

Representative DELANEY. Do you claim that all of these people who come in from outside of New York State have no right to be taxed by the State of New York?

Mr. ENGLAND. If they are living in the city or in the State of New York, I can see a reason for it.

Representative DELANEY. All right. Let me give you one further example: You are working in the navy yard in Brooklyn, N. Y. You are a resident of New Jersey. Do you feel that you should pay taxes to the State of New York?

Mr. ENGLAND. No.

Representative DELANEY. If I were to tell you that there are thousands and thousands of similar cases, people who live in the suburbs in New Jersey and Connecticut, who pay their New York State tax because they work in the State of New York, would you say that was discrimination?

Mr. ENGLAND. At the same time, Mr. Delaney, any time that they don't like it they can get out of there—right?

Representative DELANEY. There is no one holding you here, is there? [Laughter.]

Mr. ENGLAND. We are held here by the Navy Department. We have to fulfill our contracts with the Navy. We were not told about this Territorial tax by the Navy when we came over here, and we have to fulfill our contracts with the Navy, or we would have to reimburse the Navy for bringing us over here and find our own passage back, and also to our home State.

Representative DELANEY. Did you make the inquiry?

Mr. ENGLAND. Did we make an inquiry?

Representative DELANEY. Did you make an inquiry before you signed the contract as to what taxes and what conditions were to be found in Hawaii?

Mr. ENGLAND. No; I didn't.

Representative DELANEY. And if you made a contract with your same party in the State of Wisconsin and were brought to New York, you would have to pay the New York State income tax?

Mr. ENGLAND. But still you are there, and you can get out of there. It isn't a question of being held there. The way we are here, don't forget that we are 2,400 miles from the mainland.

Representative DELANEY. Now, let's get this clear: There is no one holding you here except that there is a breach of your contract, and you pay your own transportation; is that right?

Mr. ENGLAND. You also pay the Navy for the cost of bringing you over here.

Representative DELANEY. Well, isn't that transportation?

Mr. ENGLAND. That is, practically. [Laughter.]

Representative DELANEY. All right. No other questions.

Chairman LARCADE. Any other member of the committee desirous to question the witness?

(Witness excused.)

Chairman LARCADE. The next witness listed is Richard M. Kageyama. Will you give your business and background for the committee so that they may evaluate it?

Mr. KAGEYAMA. My name is Richard M. Kageyama; age, 29; born and legal resident of Territory of Hawaii; veteran of World War II, 5 years—56 months—in the armed forces; discharged December 1945.

The statehood question for Hawaii has been a historical topic for many years, and it has been before Congress on many occasions. To incorporate Hawaii into the Union of States is more important to America, more significant for our future, than the admission of any State since the beginning of the Republic. If I can serve my purpose by my contribution to you, I hope it will be in the direction of establishing a clear understanding of the above question, and I have full confidence that this congressional Committee on Statehood will be the last of such committees to come to Hawaii to appraise Hawaii for statehood, for I firmly believe that your recommendation favorable to statehood will be acted upon by the present Seventy-ninth Congress. Therefore, I welcome this opportunity to present my revised views on the question of statehood before the members of this committee.

I am today in favor of immediate statehood for Hawaii, and shall define immediate as a period from 1 to 3 years. For your information, I did oppose statehood in 1937 on the grounds that we were then not ready for our diploma. But the very fact that the people of Hawaii have met the supreme test in the most critical period in the history of the islands in relation to our Nation and of the world, clearly indicates that the problems have been met and that we are now ready to be admitted, after your reexamination of Hawaii's condition in regards to statehood.

Four years since Pearl Harbor and the people of Hawaii can now look back confidently and reply to any critics that our records do speak for us, and further with pride, we can point out to a splendid record of faithful service and loyalty to the United States.

Said Representative Thomas Rolph of California:

We must salute the devoted people of Hawaii who have so loyally fought our cause and given so much since December 7, 1941. They never faltered, they never lost heart for a second, they know what they were up against, but they dug in all the harder. It is fitting that I take this opportunity of expressing the admiration every American feels for our countrymen way out there in the middle of the Pacific.

If the committee desires, I will state briefly two examples in refutation of the argument that under statehood, elections will be controlled by a single racial group: (a) School election, (b) local county election.

If not I would like to submit the report of the Joint Committee on Hawaii Statehood, page 36, Senate Document No. 151.

A subject of considerable local discussion is the question of racial bloc voting. The results of the elections do not furnish any evidence that any group is addicted to voting across party lines to any great extent because of racial ties. Local observers state that all groups except the Hawaii do so vote to some extent, but the elective officers are predominantly Hawaiian and Caucasian, with less than a proportionate representation of other races. Acquaintance with mainland conditions demands recognition of the fact that racial voting is by no means unusual, and seems to be indulged less in Hawaii than on the mainland. It will be noted that no one group dominates the electorate nor seems likely to do so; and it is certain that the practice of voting by racial blocs by one group would soon evoke reprisals by the others. So far, it is safe to say that elections have been decided on individual merit and party allegiance rather than racial ties, and no good reasons exist for believing that any different policy will be accepted by the citizenry in the future. The immediate future holds no threat of any cleavage between the different groups of the Hawaiian electorate.

I would like to make certain recommendations, if it is feasible, within the framework of our constitution:

1. If Congress denies statehood for Hawaii, I propose that the Constitution be amended to insert the words "and organized Territories," after the word "States," except the words "United States."

Illustration: Article I, section 2: The House of Representatives shall be composed of members chosen every second year by the people of the several States and organized Territories, and the electors in each State and organized Territory shall have the qualifications, et cetera.

2. Permit organized territories to send three Representatives to Congress, with no vote, or send to Congress representatives based on population, with the power to vote. Rules and regulations are controlled by the Rules Committee of each House. Today our Delegate has no vote, either in the House or in the committee.

3. To amend the organic act, permitting the election of all offices, including the Governor, and the cost to be paid by the Territory. A law should be enacted on this recommendation, stating that all congressional appropriations shall automatically include any organized Territories.

4. Request that this committee recommend that the question of statehood for Hawaii be considered by Congress, because we are now ready to be admitted into the Union of States, and to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitutional and State government, and further, to be admitted into the Union, with a provision that reapportionment be made mandatory before a constitutional convention.

5. Request that this committee recommend to the Territorial legislature at its next session and submit to Congress for approval an act to be known as "Veterans' Homestead Act," to set aside land for home ownership, homesteading and small farming for veterans, and especially for disabled veterans.

Now the question is, Why should Hawaii be made a State?

1. Because the people of Hawaii have so indicated in their plebiscite of 1940, which was one of the recommendations made by the 1937 Statehood Committee.

2. Because sections 3 and 4 of the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution does not apply to Hawaii.

Section 3. New States may be admitted by the Congress into this Union, et cetera. Paragraph 2:

The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the Territory or their property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so constituted as to prejudice any claims of the United States or of any particular State.

Section 4:

The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a republican form of government, and shall protect each of them against invasion, and on application of the legislature, or of the Executive (when the legislature cannot be convened) against domestic violence.

But a greater and far more important question beside the above that you and the Nation have often asked is, What can Hawaii contribute to the United States when she becomes a State?

A very fine and sensible question that we, the people of Hawaii, will not hesitate to answer. Therefore, I shall deal with the question of statehood by trying to answer the question.

If Hawaii becomes a State it is not the wonders of Waikiki Beach, nor the volcanoes, nor the scenery of Hawaii, nor the sugar and pineapple, but Hawaii will be contributing representatives with a background of human relations and understanding, which the world needs very badly today.

No one can deny that tolerance and racial democracy exist in Hawaii. This is shown in our daily political, social, educational, and economic life of Hawaii. Racial discrimination is small, and if there is any, it is the exception to the general rule. Interracial marriage is not barred by law, like some of the States, and as I believe in interracial marriage, I would like to add the remarks of the 1937 Committee on Statehood, that "the figures today warrant the conclusion that before the end of the century the great majority of the people of Hawaii will be partly of Hawaiian ancestry."

Perhaps Hawaii's tolerance is due to her complex population. The fundamental principle of democracy is at work here. But the main point is that people of diverse extractions get along well here. Further, we will be contributing a State in likeness of a world which is condensed to the size of Hawaii, in which the Nation can point with pride the progressive tolerance that exists here, of course admitting that there is room for improvement. But all this cannot be accomplished without your aid as Congressmen from the 48 States.

Further, the National Congress will be contributing to the world the understanding of mankind, and will in reality come out of America the cradle of democracy, a new Declaration of Independence for the whole world.

In answer to what contribution can Hawaii give to the Nation and the world, Congress will give the world a State on which a diversified group of people can live harmoniously and creatively, and such a credit of bringing the people of the world to Hawaii must be given to the sugar industry, and to those individuals who pioneered that adventure to Hawaii.

Permit me to quote the Star Bulletin clipping of July 24 by the Right Reverend S. Little, retired Protestant bishop of Honolulu, in

a sermon entitled, "Interracial Relationship Color Blind," at the Cathedral of St. John in New York:

The residents of Hawaii are truly color blind because experience has taught them all major colors and shades of different races and nationalities are needed to form a human rainbow of completeness and beauty. Further, there is an immediate need for the application of attitudes and methods manifestly successful in Hawaii, affording equality of opportunity and all it involves to the solution of racial problems of the mainland."

He said the Hawaiians recognize and appreciate the contribution all men of all kinds have brought to the total good will and progress of the world.

Therefore, any action by the United States Congress in granting Hawaii statehood will offer to the world the faith that you have in democracy and mankind. Whatever good relations established by our armed forces throughout the four corners of the world will be stimulated by making Hawaii a State. Our daily military casualty list contains such names as O'Brien, Goldberg, Mueller, Di Angelo, Lee Chang, Kealoha, Matsumoto, Domingo, Rodriques, Medeiros, et cetera.

Col. E. R. Powless, member for New Zealand on the Allied Far-Eastern Advisory Commission, said on December 29, *Star Bulletin*:

New Zealand hopes Hawaii will be granted its rightful status as the forty-ninth State. The eyes of all Pacific people are upon Hawaii to see what the United States will do with this Territory which now has a colonial status. We in New Zealand believe that Hawaii is conscious of its colonial status and as a result devotes too much time to what the mother country may think of it. We believe Hawaii should be granted statehood so that it can take its rightful place in Pacific affairs. Hawaii should be granted statehood so that its energies can be devoted fully to mutual efforts to solve the many problems facing us in the Pacific.

The history of democracy, as Whitman said—

remains unwritten, because human freedom must be systematically and positively organized by conscious will and purpose.

As to common will and purpose, we have first of all our high tradition of idealism, decency, and fair play, and our heritage of faith in government of the people, by the people, and for the people. There is no question whatsoever that the great majority of the American people accept these ideals. This is not a matter of opinion but of history. America fought one of the bloodiest and most destructive wars in history to settle the slavery question, to save the world for democracy, and we have just emerged from a conflict of world ideology. So that understanding of mankind will be Hawaii's contribution to our Nation and the world at large, and only by the act of Congress can this contribution be made. World events demand such action, and your faith and vote in such action will not be in vain. To you, as leaders of our Nation today, I am seeking for the best guidance and leadership of this age, so that we of tomorrow may be guided by your wise counseling and hope to pass on to the future generation your wise leadership and our new experience.

Never was the world making history so rapidly as in our times, as we watch it, as it takes place. Nothing is now done in a corner of the world today. What happens in the remotest part of the world today is spread before us in tomorrow's newspaper. Said Kipling:

Months have been cut down to weeks and weeks to days in the transport of men and things; and unless all signs fail, we are on the edge of further unbelievable

cuts in time. The transport of thoughts which carries with it man's most intimate associations, has outstripped not only belief, but the speed of thought itself.

That is how it is that the moving pageant of all the nations of the earth passes before our eyes day by day. We are listening to the heavy tread of events marching on, and we in turn ask, marching to where?

In conclusion, as Wendell L. Willkie said, that the people of the world want us to join them in creating a new society of independent nations, and want us neither to hesitate to speak out for the correction of injustices anywhere in the world, and are waiting no less eagerly for us to accept the most challenging opportunity of all history, the chance to help create a new society in which men and women the world around can live and grow invigorated by independence and freedom.

Therefore, we, the people of Hawaii, believe that by granting to Hawaii her desire to be partners in our Republic in a sovereign Nation of many sovereign States, established upon the principles of freedom, equality, justice, and humanity, will illustrate to the world that our Nation, founded upon the principle that men are created equal, means just that. And for further exhibit, I would like to introduce the American public opinion sponsored by Mr. Gallup on the question "Would you favor admitting Hawaii to the Union?" which has been favorably reported throughout the Nation. A copy from the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, dated January 5, 1946, entitled "Hearing of Statehood and the Significance," and the Honolulu Advertiser of March 6, 1945, "What Went on in Statehood Hearings at Our Senatorial Session in 1945." I submit these. [Handing exhibit 73 to the Chair.]

Chairman LARCADE. Without objection, the witness may file the documents which he has referred to. Are there any questions?

Representative ANGELL. What is your occupation, sir?

Mr. KAGEYAMA. Sir?

Representative ANGELL. What is your occupation?

Mr. KAGEYAMA. Today? I am with the Veterans' Administration.

Representative ANGELL. Where did you get your education?

Mr. KAGEYAMA. Hilo High School, sir.

Representative ANGELL. You just have a high-school education?

Mr. KAGEYAMA. Yes, sir.

Representative ANGELL. How long were you in the service?

Mr. KAGEYAMA. Five years, fifty-six months to be exact.

Representative ANGELL. Where did you serve?

Mr. KAGEYAMA. I served in the Territory, sir. I'd like to state that we have performed one of the greater American experiments conducted by the War Department, and that was the bringing about and the experimentation of the American Transport Service. And we have been a nucleus in these experiments that were conducted by the War Department at the outstart of the war. We were down the water front and have carried on the duties of stevedore and other of these experiments. The War Department found something new in the way of supplying the men in front with certain equipment and supplies, and they found a new department or branch to be organized in the War Department.

Representative ANGELL. Where were you born?

Mr. KAGEYAMA. I was born on the island of Hawaii.

Representative ANGELL. You lived here all your life?

Mr. KAGEYAMA. Yes, all my life.

Representative ANGELL. What is your racial derivation?

Mr. KAGEYAMA. I am a full American of Japanese stock.

Representative ANGELL. Your parents were born in Japan?

Mr. KAGEYAMA. Yes, sir; my father is dead and my mother is still living.

Representative ANGELL. She is living here?

Mr. KAGEYAMA. Yes, sir.

Representative ANGELL. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. KAGEYAMA. Thank you.

Chairman LARCADE. Well, now, we will now take a 5-minute recess to change stenographers. [Applause.]

(A short recess was taken at this point.)

AFTER RECESS

Chairman LARCADE. We have a fresh stenographer now. The meeting will come to order. The next witness who has filed with the committee is Oscar Smith. Mr. Smith, will you give your name and business background for the reporter.

Mr. SMITH. My name is Oscar Smith. I am personnel supervisor at Pearl Harbor.

Chairman LARCADE. Of what organization?

Mr. SMITH. Navy. If you want some more of my background, I'll be very happy to give it to you.

Chairman LARCADE. Yes.

Mr. SMITH. I was born in the State of Kentucky. I was raised in the State of Ohio. I was a graduate of the Kentucky State University.

Chairman LARCADE. You may proceed.

Delegate FARRINGTON. How long have you resided in the Territory.

Mr. SMITH. About 13 months.

Delegate FARRINGTON. You are a resident, citizen, of the State of Kentucky?

Mr. SMITH. That's right. I am domiciled in the State of Kentucky.

Delegate FARRINGTON. Citizen of Kentucky?

Mr. SMITH. That's right. I am entering my protest on these grounds—if you bear with me a few moments: *Resolved by the following State Clubs, Pearl Harbor Navy Yard, CHA 3:*

That statehood for Hawaii be deferred until such times as the following conditions are corrected under a reasonable form of government:

Basic English as taught here in the grade schools is the lowest in the Nation. This should be corrected by a 10-year plan which would enable the school board to secure mainland teachers for these grades, the first to eighth.

We firmly are of the opinion that the school department should be run by the citizens or those who have children attending the public schools.

Statehood should be deferred until such time as the Territory sees fit to give to the people the right to vote for their school commissioners. This method of electing the school board would place the responsibility on the people, where it belongs, when the people of Hawaii have a voice in their school department and not be compelled to accept whatever the administration appoints to run the school department.

Statehood should be deferred. On December 6, 1941, there were around 30,000 to 40,000 students attending the Japanese-language schools in Hawaii, where they were taught the same customs, manners, and habits common to the students in the Japanese Empire. This method of teaching American-born children manners and customs of an enemy nation should be deferred until the people of Hawaii see to it that American, and only American, ideas and ideals are taught.

Statehood should be deferred until such time as the Hawaiian voters of all races realize the necessity of two or more strong political parties in the Territory—it is our view and opinion that both political parties here in the Territory are not of the people but are operated by selfish interests.

We members of the various State clubs, CHA 3, Pearl Harbor, having lived in Hawaii for the past 3 to 5 years have grown to love and respect certain aspects of Hawaii and her people, but nevertheless this is not the time nor will it be possible for Hawaii to operate as a State in the Union of States for at least 30 years.

Statehood should be deferred, but we stress the importance that the Territory of Hawaii be permitted to have two Senators and two Congressmen elected by the people of Hawaii to serve the interest of the territory in Washington, D. C., as Senators and Congressmen from the Territory of Hawaii.

These four votes in the National Congress should be real men of the people in every respect, who will have the interest of all the people and not the interest of a selfish group. Such would be the case at present, and has been for some years past. Give the people of Hawaii representation in the National Congress by fearless, honest men, and by their actions therein will show to the Nation at large that Hawaii has a political soul of her own.

Yes, let Hawaii have representation through the National Congress on affairs affecting the Nation as a Territory. At the same time the Federal Government will retain control as at present through the powers to appoint the Governor, judicial and other Federal department heads.

Gentlemen, this is signed by various different presidents of the Territorial clubs in Hawaii, of Hawaii.

Chairman LARCADE. I suggest you file the statement, so that the names of the other men who join you in this statement may be disclosed in the record. [Exhibit No. 74.]

Mr. SMITH. Absolutely, they are all here.

(The names shown on the resolution presented by Mr. Smith are as follows:)

	<i>State clubs</i>
Oscar Smith_____	Kentucky
Robert Evans_____	Do.
James P. Carter_____	North Carolina
Edward Howe (U. P.)_____	War Dads
C. T. Sahappa_____	Pennsylvania
	(Pittsburgh, Pa.)
James Howard_____	Ohio
E. W. Dickerson_____	Massachusetts
Bob England_____	Wisconsin

Chairman LARCADE. You may proceed.

Mr. SMITH. In addition to this, in the past year, and it's not a hidden secret by any means, one of your supervisors, a gentleman by the name

of Mr. Wright, he came out and he called us Pearl Harbor workers the scum of the earth. We are American citizens. We resent the fact. He also came out and stated that Hawaii had purchased more bonds than any State in the Union. He overlooked the fact that the loyal and the scum of the earth was working in Hawaii, and that we had bought during 1943 and 1944 and 1945, \$7,624,239.75 through our payroll deduction of Pearl Harbor Navy Yard. Those are facts, gentlemen. You can check on them.

Now another reason we oppose statehood at the present time is for the simple reason, living in a naval housing project, in CHA 3, we are not allowed any privilege whatsoever that is accorded the citizens of Hawaii. Still we are subject to the laws and the taxation and various other elements that the free voter, the free thinker, and the man that has protection in Hawaii. We have none of those from the Territory of Hawaii. We have our own civil service police. We have our own church, and whatever entertainment we have, we have in our area.

Now that brings us back to a sore subject. I hate to step on Mr. Delaney's toes. I don't hold it against him because he is from New York. He can't help that. But nevertheless I question a statement that he made a while ago. Possibly I don't have any right to question that statement. He asked the gentlemen from Wisconsin, did Wisconsin rule the United States, does New York or the 48 States rule the United States?

Chairman LARCADE. Well, sir, I'll have to ask you to confine your testimony to the question under consideration. As I stated before, this committee is not here to answer questions but to ask them, under the subject under consideration.

Mr. SMITH. I appreciate that. That's all I have, in view of that fact.

Chairman LARCADE. Any questions?

Representative DELANEY. Yes, sir, I have some questions. You made a charge here that the people of Hawaii were not able to conduct their own school system.

Mr. SMITH. Right.

Representative DELANEY. And during the week here, and for the past 10 days, we have taken the testimony of experts, men who are qualified, who understand school systems, some of them professors, some educators, and they tell us that the school system of Hawaii compare favorably with most all of the States of the Union, and in many cases are far superior to some States. Have you any evidence to dispute that fact?

Mr. SMITH. Yes, I think you have it there [pointing to document on the table].

Representative DELANEY. You mean your own statement, is that right?

Mr. SMITH. I think it is substantiated by several—

Representative DELANEY. By several of you people?

Mr. SMITH. That's right.

Representative DELANEY. Have you made a study of the school system in any of the other States of the United States?

Mr. SMITH. I certainly have.

Representative DELANEY. When?

Mr. SMITH. Oh, no longer than 1939, 1940, 1941, 1942, 1943. My work has been personnel work. I have been in contact with human problems throughout all my life.

Representative DELANEY. That's very fine. Would you say that a man, say a citizen of Hawaii, who went to Kentucky and was employed there in some project, that he was qualified as an expert to testify as to whether or not the school system of Kentucky was sufficient to take care of the needs of Kentucky?

Mr. SMITH. Well, I think that you are rather trying to confuse the question, are you not?

Representative DELANEY. I'll try and make it clear. You just follow me, you answer my questions.

Mr. SMITH. I think the chairman asked me, this is on statehood, was it not?

Representative DELANEY. Well, I believe that's what you are here for.

Mr. SMITH. That's right.

Representative DELANEY. And one of the things we consider is whether or not this Territory is able to take care of its own affairs, and among affairs we consider education.

Mr. SMITH. That's right.

Representative DELANEY. And we have received testimony here of experts. Now you come in as a 13-month resident and tell us, as a committee, that the people of Hawaii are not able to take care of their educational system. You consider yourself an expert, is that right?

Mr. SMITH. No, I don't, but people can live in a place for a lifetime and know nothing about it. I think you realize that.

Representative DELANEY. You have been here 13 months, is that right?

Mr. SMITH. Correct.

Representative DELANEY. And you feel you are able to testify?

Mr. SMITH. I feel that I am able to testify and substantiate everything that was written in that statement.

Representative DELANEY. Will you tell us specifically in what manner the people of Hawaii during the 13 months that you have been here are not able to take care of their educational system?

Mr. SMITH. Well, in the first place, they complete 3 years in high school, in your language, and back in New York, is that exactly according to Hoyle?

Representative DELANEY. I ask the questions here. You make the statements. We will appraise them.

Mr. SMITH. I did.

Representative DELANEY. Will you tell us, will you tell this committee why the people of Hawaii are not able to take care of their school system?

Mr. SMITH. Because they are backward in the educational program. They don't have the facilities.

Representative DELANEY. We want to respect your opinion. Now can you show us any concrete evidence that the educational system of Hawaii is backward?

Mr. SMITH. All I can tell you is, those people I have talked to, and they tell me the amount of education they have obtained in Hawaii, and I can see how behind it is in the normal grades in the States.

Representative DELANEY. And you feel that because of that reason they shouldn't be admitted to statehood?

Mr. SMITH. That, and other reasons I have stated.

Representative DELANEY. Well, all right. Now, let's go into this tax matter.

Mr. SMITH. Very good.

Representative DELANEY. If you were a resident of the State of New York you would have to pay a tax?

Mr. SMITH. If I was domiciled there.

Representative DELANEY. If you came from Kentucky and obtained employment in the State of New York you would be subject to the taxes of the State of New York?

Mr. SMITH. I would be subject to the tax of New York, and as far as, if it exceeded the taxation in the State of Kentucky.

Representative DELANEY. Well, now, I don't want to dispute your statement, but you would be subject to taxes in New York?

Mr. SMITH. Like I said, yes, sir.

Representative DELANEY. And do you say that the State of New York is not authorized to levy that tax?

Mr. SMITH. I did not say that. I would be only subject to taxation in excess of the income tax within my own State.

Representative DELANEY. That, of course, I don't agree with. Do you say the people of this Territory have not the right to tax the residents?

Mr. SMITH. Not as long as I live on a Government reservation they have no right to tax me.

Representative DELANEY. You believe in an American form of government, do you?

Mr. SMITH. I certainly do.

Representative DELANEY. You have a group that you represent?

Mr. SMITH. I certainly do.

Representative DELANEY. When you have a grievance you have a right to appeal to the courts?

Mr. SMITH. Absolutely.

Representative DELANEY. And have you appealed to the courts?

Mr. SMITH. Well——

Representative DELANEY. Yes. And you are willing to abide by the decision of the courts?

Mr. SMITH. To a certain extent, yes.

Representative DELANEY. Now you say here, in another accusation, that those who are in the legislature are selfish, is that right?

Mr. SMITH. That's right.

Representative DELANEY. Have you any specific instance where men elected to the Legislature of Hawaii have been selfish or have served their own selfish interests?

Mr. SMITH. Listen, Mr. Delaney——

Representative DELANEY. I asked the question.

Mr. SMITH. I meet quite a few of Hawaii's officials. Will you let me answer it in my own way?

Representative DELANEY. You are entitled to whatever latitude you need, as long as you keep on the subject.

Mr. SMITH. I met Chief Associate Judge Kemp, I have met Judge Metzger, also the Governor. I find them to be fine people. But

understand, justice can be misconstrued lots of times. You, as a Congressman, know that.

Representative DELANEY. I asked you whether or not these people were able to govern themselves.

Mr. SMITH. I say no, I don't think they are.

Representative DELANEY. Well, that's your opinion.

Mr. SMITH. That's right.

Representative DELANEY. Have you any concrete evidence of cases where they served, as you say, their own selfish interests?

Mr. SMITH. Why do you question me so much, when these other people come up and make their statement, and you pick on me?

Chairman LARCADE. Let's have order.

Representative DELANEY. You are offering yourself here for certain testimony, and I have the right to interrogate you.

Mr. SMITH. That's right.

Representative DELANEY. You made a very serious charge, that these people who are legislators are selfish, and if they are, I want to know, and so do the other members of this committee, but I don't want hearsay evidence. I want some concrete examples. Can you cite me one?

Mr. SMITH. No, I can produce it to you if you will give me a little time. I didn't know I was going to be quizzed this way.

Representative DELANEY. How long do you need?

Mr. SMITH. How long will you be here?

Representative DELANEY. Until Saturday morning. If you can get in proper form, if you can get in proper form affidavits, we'd be glad to include them in the record, so that when the entire Congress of the United States review the facts on whether or not Hawaii should be admitted, that they will have the benefit of your statements and your affidavits.

Mr. SMITH. Very well, you shall have it Friday evening. You name the hour.

Chairman LARCADE. Any other questions?

Representative MILLER. Yes. You have introduced the subject of the education in Hawaii. I happen to be somewhat familiar with educational conditions in the country. Do you know what the average classroom expenditure per year is for this Territory?

Mr. SMITH. What do you mean, in what grade?

Representative MILLER. Well, in educational circles we generally speak and measure the day by a classroom unit. If you are familiar with education, you know what a classroom unit is.

Mr. SMITH. Yes, but what grade are you teaching?

Representative MILLER. I am asking for an expenditure per classroom unit in the Territory.

Mr. SMITH. I never taught school—I only attended.

Representative MILLER. Have you any idea where the expenditures per classroom unit, or the comparison in Hawaii with the other States in the Union?

Mr. SMITH. Would you define that more clearly?

Representative MILLER. Well, you are holding yourself up as an expert, and I am—

Mr. SMITH. I am an average layman.

Representative MILLER. If you are going to judge, the classroom unit is the expenditures to maintain a unit of 27 students, and is used today more to gage education than the per capita expenditure per pupil, because in the small schoolroom unit you may only have a few children, and it would build that cost up. So the NEA today is using a classroom unit more as a unit of measurement. I was just wondering if you knew—

Mr. SMITH. I haven't attended school recently.

Representative MILLER. You apparently haven't attended school. Well, I'll tell you. It is about fifth. It ranks next to New York, which is first, California, a number of States come in there, and Hawaii is about fifth. It would be interesting to compare it with your State of Kentucky.

Mr. SMITH. You could substantiate that, I suppose?

Representative MILLER. Yes, I can.

Chairman LARCADE. Mr. Miller, may I put the question in another way? Do you know what the annual per capita cost per pupil for educational purposes in the Territory of Hawaii is?

Mr. SMITH. Not definitely, I do not, no, sir.

Chairman LARCADE. Any other question?

(No response.)

Chairman LARCADE. You may retire.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you.

Chairman LARCADE. The next witness will be Walter Mihata. Give your full name and—

(Mr. Smith withdraws, and Mr. Mihata takes the witness chair.)

Mr. MIHATA. My name is Walter Mihata. I am an American of Japanese ancestry, born and raised in the Territory, educated in the public schools here, graduated from the university in 1928. The only claim to fame that I take is that I was part of Colonel Clark's team there, way back in 1926. I was honorably discharged from service on the 17th of November 1945. Before volunteering for service I was employed by the Consolidated Amusement Co. as a theater manager. At the present time I am taking things easy, getting acquainted with my family. We AJA's—I'd like to use the term "AJA" to speak of the Americans of Japanese ancestry—have always been accepted by our friends of other racial groups here in Hawaii as Americans, and it was a natural American patent that, together with the thousands of other sons of Hawaii, as good Americans we did our duty on the battle fronts and on the home fronts. Not by our choosing, but by order of the War Department, many of our group fought as members of the One Hundreth Battalion, the Four Hundred and Forty-second Combat Team, and a number of us greater than those fought in Europe; fought against Japan, the country of our ancestors.

Of course we were a unique group. Naturally we made good newspaper copy. This, gentlemen, was not of our asking, or of our doing. We simply did our duty as did thousands of other sons of Hawaii, as did millions of other Americans. And we, as a racial group, do not and have not claimed credit for it. If any credit is due, as sons of Hawaii, we want the entire Territory which educated and had faith in us to get the credit. We simply fulfilled our duties as American soldiers, and in vital work on the home front, not so much to prove

our loyalty, but more to justify the faith that our friends in Hawaii had in us.

It is a matter of record that we came through with flying colors, and I am not here to present you any written statements as to our records, because our record is incorporated in the records of the peoples of Hawaii. We even had no intention of appearing here at this hearing, because, as being part of the people of Hawaii, we were ably represented here by our leaders, and the only reason why I am appearing here before you this evening is because certain allegations have been made against our racial group. Of course with the few who, in spite of the hundreds of white crosses that mark the graves of our fallen comrades in Italy, France, Germany and the South Pacific, will still have you doubt our loyalty, we are not concerned with that group. For I say, gentlemen, when a man is willing to give his life in service to his country, there is certainly nothing further that he can do.

The second allegation has been made that we will come under the influence of our alien parents. I wish to assure you gentlemen that the Americanism that burns within us is so imbued, so solidly imbued, gentlemen, that our parents or any other influence will never alter it. The fact that our parents are not citizens is no fault of theirs. The law of this country denies them that right. But we have certainly educated them to our American way of life. And the behavior and the contributions that our alien parents made to the war effort is certainly obvious to you.

Some individuals have advocated the fear that we as a group will come under the influence that may emanate from Japan. It certainly did not take these individuals too long to forget that just a few months ago we whipped Japan to unconditional surrender. And gentlemen, thousands of us AJA boys played an important part in administering Japan this defeat. These individuals seem to forget that Japan today, is taking orders from us. We are even telling Japan how they should think. General MacArthur and our forces are there now, reeducating the Japanese peoples to our democratic way of life. And let me emphasize again, thousands of us AJA's are there now with General MacArthur, helping in this program. Close to 5,000 are now in training at Fort Snelling, Minn., and will soon move over to Japan to help out in this work.

To admit a fear that bad influences will emanate from Japan, which may influence us to the detriment of Hawaii and our country, would be to admit that we will fail in our occupation and reeducation of the Japanese people. I know that a thorough job will be done, and I know you gentlemen of Congress will see to it that a complete job is done before Japan is allowed to again enter the family of nations.

Such being the case, is it not about time that we can once and for all bury this so-called Japanese menace, that whenever some issue presents itself it seems to be recreated in the minds of some of our individuals? The issue has been raised on bloc voting.

And at this point, I think I should like to clear for the records that, contrary to what has been inferred by some individuals, we as a group are not the majority group of registered voters. The Caucasian group, for one group, outnumbers us. We at the present time make up 28.5 percent of the registered voters. It is my contention that this is simply

an attempt to confuse the bigger issues. We live in an American community, significant only in that we have demonstrated to the world that different racial groups can work and live together. Our problems are no different from that of other American communities. The economic question, the question of one's bread and butter, is the bigger issue. Some of AJA's work for the big interests, and some belong to labor unions. In order to safeguard one's livelihood and one's very existence, it is imperative that a person working for the big interests will vote with the big interests as opposed to a person of his own racial group who has to vote with labor.

I wish at this point also to say that Senator Kamokila Campbell, has advised us not to vote in a racial bloc. I'd like to here assure Senator Campbell that we will follow her advice and not vote in a racial bloc. But gentlemen, if we follow her advice further, as she has always requested us to do in various political campaigns, to vote the straight Democratic ticket, I'm afraid that you will find many of us AJA's voting the straight Democratic ticket. But you gentlemen of course know that the Republicans in Hawaii are not going to allow the Democrats to get away with that. And there, gentlemen, lies the second division.

In other words, gentlemen, if you are satisfied that we as a racial group are divided into different economic groups, and that some of us are Republicans and some of us are Democrats and some of us are Independents, then I say that this question of race should not enter this problem.

I would like to further point out that we as a racial group have no specific problem that confronts us alone. And there being no major problem facing us, there is certainly no necessity for us to vote as a racial bloc. There is only one menace that we as a racial group may have to fear, and that is the practice that a few narrow-minded and prejudiced individuals have of discriminating against us as a racial group. Hawaii's record of racial harmony and cooperation, however, reassures us that we did not fear this menace, but if this menace does appear, it would certainly not be un-American on our part to fight against it. Even in this fight it will not be necessary for us to fight in a racial bloc alone, for we know that the overwhelming majority of the peoples in Hawaii will join us. For in Hawaii there is no room for racial discrimination and racial intolerance. Hawaii's record shows that our consistently successful public office holders have been individuals who stand out above race, creed and class.

In conclusion, gentlemen, as AJA's we wish to assure you gentlemen that if granted statehood we, as a racial group will work hand in hand with the other good citizens of Hawaii, and will carry out our responsibilities as citizens of the 49th State in the same spirit of devotion and patriotism that we manifested on the battle fronts and on the home fronts during the war. Thank you very much.

Chairman LARCADE. Any questions?

Representative DELANEY. Just one question. I believe that you stated that those of you working for big interests will vote for big interests; was that your intention?

Mr. MIHATA. Yes, sir.

Representative DELANEY. Well, wouldn't you vote for the candidate that you thought was best fitted for office?

MR. MIHATA. But that's just the general influence, sir, big interests. For instance, we have a lot of our boys who work on sugar plantations.

Representative DELANEY. Would you vote for the candidate that was backed by the sugar plantation owners?

MR. MIHATA. Well, in most cases, yes.

Representative DELANEY. Well, do you feel that that's the American way of doing things?

MR. MIHATA. Well, as I said, in order to, for us to protect our own existence here, that's the way things generally are. Of course my contention is, on that, is, usually we have enough capable men on either party that will have sufficient capable men on the Republican Party, say the Republican Party represents the big interests—we have capable men on the Republican Party.

Representative DELANEY. Would you say that as a rule all of those of Japanese ancestry would vote that work for the big plantation owners, would work for the candidates of the plantation owners?

MR. MIHATA. That's right, sir.

Representative DELANEY. All right.

Chairman LARCADE. Any other questions?

Delegate FARRINGTON. Mr. Mihata, is it not true that many of the men presently employed in the sugar industry are members of the ILWU?

MR. MIHATA. That's right.

Delegate FARRINGTON. And that among them are many Americans of Japanese ancestry?

MR. MIHATA. That's right.

Delegate FARRINGTON. And is it not true that in the last election many of them followed the leadership of their unions in casting their ballots?

MR. MIHATA. That's right. Of course, when I said more reference with us being associated with the big interests, you'd find that quite a lot of the so-called small people around here now own stock in sugar, and some of them own Brewer's stock, American Factors' stock.

Delegate FARRINGTON. Isn't the point you are trying to make that, like most people, they vote their economic interests?

MR. MIHATA. That's right. That's the division. I simply brought that out, sir, to show the division that would come about because of economic differences.

Delegate FARRINGTON. Would you state briefly for the record your war service?

MR. MIHATA. Having been a member of that team there, that was ancient history, that was 19 years ago, I was a Reserve officer, and I volunteered to join up with the Four Hundred and Forty-Second Combat Team. But just at that point the War Department order came out barring all old-timers, that is, barring all Reserve officers over the age of 35 from active combat duty, so I was unable to join the Four Hundred and Forty-Second. So I did the next best thing. I enlisted. I volunteered in the services as a private for the Army Intelligence School. I graduated this school, and served a year and a half as the sergeant-major of the Army Intelligence Language School at Fort Snelling, Minn. Is that sufficient, sir?

Delegate FARRINGTON. That's all right.

Chairman LARCADE. Any other question? (No response.) Thank you very much, Mr. Mihata. The next witness registered with the committee is Mr. John W. McFadyen. Mr. McFadyen, give your name and business and background.

(Mr. Mihata withdraws, and Mr. McFadyen takes the witness chair.)

Mr. MCFADYEN. My name is John W. McFadyen, and I am on the grievance committee of the All-States Club at Pearl Harbor.

Chairman LARCADE. How long have you been here, sir?

Mr. MCFADYEN. I have been here about 17 months, sir.

Chairman LARCADE. Where did you come from?

Mr. MCFADYEN. I was born and raised in the town of Latrobe in the State of Pennsylvania.

Chairman LARCADE. What was your business there?

Mr. MCFADYEN. My business back in the States was as a salesman for the International Correspondence Schools of Scranton.

Chairman LARCADE. You may proceed.

Mr. MCFADYEN. As a member of the grievance committee of the Pearl Harbor All-States Club, I wish to prevent the views that seem to prevail among the different men who are members of the various State clubs at Pearl Harbor, and that is, that they seem to be opposed to statehood for Hawaii.

Representative DELANEY. Now, just one second. I don't want to interrupt, but your testimony is what seems to be—are you authorized to speak here for the members of the club?

Mr. MCFADYEN. As the other men have said, in a public meeting of our body, the All-States Club, we were sent here to present our views as men from the mainland as to our conception is—what we think of the entrance of Hawaii into the Union as a State.

Representative DELANEY. Well, then, the views you are expressing are not what seems to be—

Mr. MCFADYEN. They are the views of the members of the various State clubs.

Chairman LARCADE. You may proceed.

Mr. MCFADYEN. And I wish to say that the men think that there has been a discriminatory attitude shown to the workers by some of the public officials; some of them have been very fair with us, and some of them have not. One I have in mind in particular is Supervisor Marshall Wright. And Mr. Marshall Wright in two motions which he presented before the board of supervisors wanted both members of the armed forces and the civilian forces hired by the armed forces over here at Pearl Harbor discharged and taken back to the mainland by the people who hired them, for the simple fact that he wanted work for the people in the Territory alone, when the funds offered by the armed forces for the maintenance of our fighting forces in the Pacific was paid, not by the Territory or by any individual State in the Union, but by the Federal Government as a whole. That was their objection to Mr. Wright's opinion.

Secondly, together with this I wish to further emphasize that they think they are being discriminated against in this 2 percent Territorial tax, for this reason: As stated before, they are living on a naval reservation, they are not provided police protection by the city or county of Honolulu, or Territory of Hawaii, as living in the

area out there, which is sustained and maintained by the welfare department of the United States Navy. Their fire protection and everything else is paid for by that department out there. Furthermore, that we do not think it is fair for them to tax us when the money is coming, not from Federal or State funds, not from State funds or Territorial funds, but from Federal funds alone.

Chairman LARCADE. What is the position of this man Wright that you refer to, at the place where you—

Mr. MCFADYEN. He is a member of the board of supervisors. I don't know whether it is the city and county of Honolulu, but the board is called a board of supervisors, and in an official capacity presumably he got up and made this remark, because it has appeared several times in the local papers, and he has retracted one of these motions in regard to the armed forces, but the motion in regard to the civilian forces that were brought over here to aid the armed forces, it has been tabled three consecutive times. In other words, there has been no action taken on it whatsoever. It can be still brought up.

Chairman LARCADE. He is an official of the Territory?

Mr. MCFADYEN. Yes, sir.

Chairman LARCADE. You may proceed.

Mr. MCFADYEN. And if I may state a personal opinion, it seems to me very odd that a Territory which holds up an attitude of racial equality, why there should be so many articles appear in one of the papers in Honolulu here always seeming to knock against a certain racial element which has proven themselves outstanding in World War II, namely, the AJA's. They say there is no discrimination whatsoever of any races or anybody from the mainland or anywhere else, and still it always seems to me that they are bringing up some question of racial equality. That's all I have to say.

Chairman LARCADE. Any questions? (No response.) Thank you very much. The next witness registered with the committee is Chaplain Yamada. Give the clerk your full name and a short synopsis of yourself.

(Mr. McFadyen withdraws, and Capt. Masao Yamada takes the witness chair.)

Capt. MASAO YAMADA. My name is Masao Yamada, born in the Territory, educated in the public schools, learned my basic English there, graduated from the university in the class of 1929, took my theological training in the Auburn Theological Seminary of New York in 1933, held pastorates in Kona, Hawaii; Honomu, Hawaii; and Hanapepe, Kauai. I entered the service in May of 1943 as a chaplain of the Four Hundred and Forty-second Combat Team. I went through training with the boys, through battle in Italy and France, and am now waiting discharge. May I proceed?

Chairman LARCADE. You may proceed.

Captain YAMADA. My appearance before this committee is in the interest of immediate statehood. A small number of witnesses has implied that we should not be granted statehood because the Japanese are still a problem. I believe that the injection of the old question is unfortunate. To the majority of the progressive-minded people in Hawaii the war cleared this issue once and for all. We witnessed as on no other occasion that citizens of Hawaii, regardless of ancestry,

could pull together and get the work done. Because of my background, I take my stand to see that statehood will not be denied or lost to Hawaii on account of the Japanese question.

It was brought to your attention that statehood should not be granted to Hawaii on allegations of Japanese alien loyalty to Japan. The behavior of the Japanese aliens before or after Pearl Harbor shows that such is not the truth. The Tolan committee in Washington went on record officially to deny rumors of sabotage on December 7. In August 1943 Mr. Joseph Thornton, agent in charge of the FBI in Hawaii, went on record that there has been no case in Hawaii of foreign-directed sabotage. It is well established now, first, that the espionage work that preceded the devastating Pearl Harbor attack was made by a small group of trained agents sent from Japan, and working out of the Japanese consulate herein; second, that neither sabotage nor fifth-column activity was found to accompany or follow the attack. Alien Japanese residents in Hawaii have also been cleared by the Military Intelligence and the police department.

The authorities, however, suspected a few of the aliens. In 1941, out of the total alien population of 35,183, 879 were temporarily detained and 578 finally interned. Soon after their evacuation to the mainland, 301 were released, leaving only 277 in custodial detention for the duration. This number is less than 1 percent of the total alien population. The greater majority, the 99 percent, have not been suspected.

When a quota was given for aliens to serve in the United States Army, there was no trouble in obtaining volunteers. Forty aliens were inducted immediately into the Army. Aliens were employed in confidential work. Fifteen to twenty served with the OWI, the FCC, and the FBI.

On December 7, when the call of blood donors was announced, the aliens stood alongside with other donors and gave their blood. In 1942 out of 8,421 donors of blood on Oahu, 2,447 were Japanese.

The aliens, who constituted 90 percent of the truck farmers in the Territory, were asked to increase their production on relatively few acres of land. Before the war, in October 1941, they produced greens and leafy vegetables up to 922,000 pounds. Eighty percent of the hog raisers were Japanese. In 1942, on Oahu, they produced 4½ million pounds of pork; in 1943, 5½ million pounds; and in 1944, 6½ million pounds. Sixty percent of the poultry raisers were Japanese. In spite of war restrictions and feed shortages, they supplied the hospitals and markets with fresh eggs.

When the Army called for volunteers to aid in keawe clearance, the aliens did their share. On Kauai, where records were kept, the keawe volunteers worked three out of four Sundays for 24 months. They contributed 60,000 workdays in the direct defense of the island. The Army took 300 or more aliens into the Kauai airport to cut keawe trees while the battle of Midway raged in June 1942. They were not afraid of the Japanese aliens. In fact, Brig. Gen. A. E. Anderson, of New York, wrote:

Please express through your committee my sincere appreciation of the excellent work being performed by Kauai residents of Japanese ancestry who have volunteered their services as a labor battalion. This work is a definite con-

tribution to the establishment of the defensive installations necessary for the protection of this island.

The Japanese aliens have shown their appreciation and loyalty to America in encouraging enlistments of their sons. They sent from their homes 52 percent of all soldiers inducted into the Army from Hawaii. Two statements made by aliens substantiate their unmis-takable stand. On December 12, 1940, the Honolulu Advertiser, over the signature of its publisher, Lorrin P. Thurston, published this editorial, I quote:

Would that thousands of Americans could have sat in with me last week on a little dinner party given on Molokai. After the good, but simple, meal had been served, the toastmaster, an American of Japanese ancestry, got up and said that on behalf of the restaurant owner and his wife we had gathered to honor the Libby boys who had been chosen. They wished to thank the guests for honoring their house. He then said, "the father of the American boy of Japanese ancestry," who has been called, wishes me to present his speech, which I quote in essence. It would pay every American to study it well.

"We are gathered together here tonight to honor three men, whom the United States Government has favored. Among them is my boy. For many years Libby, McNeill & Libby have given me employment. They have treated me well, and I have been able to educate my boy. He is going to serve in the Army of his country. I am proud that he is one of those so honored. I am an alien Japanese, and can never be anything else under the laws of America. I am proud and happy my son, who is an American by reason of his birth and on account of his loyalty, is one of those who will leave Libby, McNeill & Libby to serve.

"If the time comes, which I hope it will not, when he has to carry arms against the country of which his father is a citizen, I want him to do so. He will only be doing the right thing, the thing that any American citizen must do. All of us have our duties and responsibilities. His is plain, and next Monday he will start his service to his country. His mother and I naturally hate to see him go, but I want everyone here to know he goes with our full approval. We hope that he will always be a credit to his country and to his parents."

As the chairman read his speech, the father sat alongside, his eyes on the table, listening intently. At the end he rose and stood quietly while the room resounded with applause, then he gravely bowed and sat down. No one could deny the honesty of his words, nor the sincerity which characterized his entire attitude.

In March 1944 an elderly Japanese who lost one son fighting in Europe, speaking on behalf of four families who received Purple Heart medals posthumously, said:

The loss of our sons at Cassino, Italy, while fighting for the United States, has been a great shock to us. It has brought the war into our homes and made us realize the realities of this great struggle. We know that it is a great honor to make this supreme sacrifice in defense of one's country, but deep down in our hearts, as parents, we miss our boys and weep over the cruel fate which rubbed out their lives when they were just beginning to live. We blame this upon Japan, which attacked the United States and started this war. We blame Japan as the evil instrument of destruction which indirectly caused the death of our boys, and until Japan is brought down upon her knees for her dastardly crime, we shall not be satisfied.

The alien influence on the citizens of Japanese ancestry has been brought out as a case against statehood. This assertion is not true of the Niseis that I know. This issue is dead as far as we are concerned. Even the mainland Army officers seeing the Niseis for the first time learned quickly that they were like other Americans in their outlook and loyalty. An incident occurred at the beginning of the war which substantiates this claim.

When the first combat troops, elements of the famed Twenty-seventh Division of New York, arrived on Kauai in April 1942, a Japanese-American interviewed the commander of the task force. After discussing plans for the emergency evacuation of civilians, the lieutenant colonel ended his remarks, looking straight into the face of the Japanese-American, saying, "I don't trust you."

Like an ordinary American, this Japanese-American pastor replied as expected:

If you cannot trust a Christian pastor, I wonder whom you can trust. I am not ashamed to tell you that I am Japanese. I was born on Kauai, educated in American schools, and I don't know anything but the American way of life. As a high-school kid I became a Christian, under my mother's protest. I accepted Christianity because I wanted to become a real American from within, and I became a preacher because I knew Christianity is the religion of our democracy. When I started my ministry here I was not fully supported by the plantations and the white leaders. They were enthusiastically supporting the Japanese schools, the various temples and institutions that tried to indoctrinate the young citizens with Jap ideas. If you cannot trust me, sir, I think you ought to be man enough to shoot me.

Later the lieutenant colonel apologized, and appointed the same Japanese-American as the liaison officer between his troops and the civilian Japanese population. The Niseis are ordinary citizens that need not be feared by anyone in Hawaii as affected by alien loyalty.

The Japanese, both aliens and citizens, are not a problem to hinder statehood for Hawaii. They have been dragged out into the fight because there is no other reasonable case against statehood. Hawaii has proved, with its various racial elements, that she is capable of self-government. The Japanese proved that they are able to work together with others and get the work done. There is no practical reason why Hawaii should not be granted statehood immediately.

Chairman LARCADE. Thank you very much. Any questions by any members of the committee? [No response.] Thank you very much for this fine statement. The next witness—

Representative MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if it would be well to let the record show the captain is the wearer of the Purple Heart and the Presidential citation.

Chairman LARCADE. I think that will be most appropriate, and the clerk will make the proper notation in the record. The next witness is Mr. Sam Van Culin. Will you give your business and background?

(Captain Yamada withdraws, and Mr. Sam Van Culin takes the witness chair.)

Mr. SAM VAN CULIN, Jr. My name is Sam Van Culin, Jr. I am 15 years of age, of English, Dutch, French, and Hawaiian ancestry, island-born.

I appear before you as an individual with a desire to express sincerely my own ideas and opinions on the subject of statehood. I represent no group—I speak for myself.

I am in favor of statehood for Hawaii. It is my home, and I expect to live here a good part of my life, and I would like to share in the privileges and responsibilities of an American citizen, which I am by birth. I believe that among other things these privileges are—voting for the President of the United States and having a voice through Senators and Representatives in Congress, in the affairs of the whole Nation. The youth of the mainland have before them the opportunity

of controlling their Nation's Government. I feel that the youth of the Territory should have this same opportunity as citizens of that Government. This opportunity does not exist today. We have only to look forward to running our own Territorial government. Through statehood we accept the responsibilities of our Nation and our State and participate actively in its affairs. We deserve this right.

The youth of Hawaii are educated well. We are taught by teachers who are among the best paid in the Nation. The department of public instruction which controls the public education of Hawaii's youth is a unique set-up. Being centralized under one head, each public school of the Territory shares mutually the benefits of education. We have in the Territory no "little red school houses" as exist in parts of the mainland. The country school and the city school are on an equal par. The entire student youth of the Territory both rural and city, are instructed during 9 months of the calendar year with the 3 months lapse for summer vacation. Children of all races are taught to speak English. Japanese and Chinese language schools are not in existence.

As a Territory our Federal taxes exceed that of 14 States of America. Without congressional representation and vote, it is hardly fair to assume that this taxation is justified. As a Territory we command enough area and possess a large enough population to qualify us for statehood. These facts have been placed before you gentlemen already.

It is interesting to note that it was originally understood that Hawaii would become a State at some time in the future. At the present time the Territory desires statehood. A plebiscite vote showed a ratio of 2 to 1 for statehood in Hawaii. There is no more opportune time than at the present to afford Hawaii the good fortunes of statehood which were originally promised her. As a Territory, laws passed by Hawaii's Territorial Legislature can be vetoed by the Congress of the United States at any time. True, this veto power has not been exercised by our Nation's Government—but it does exist and it is entirely fair to assume that it is a threat to the Territory.

Records show that 85 percent of the people of Hawaii vote. This is a high average and something which we can be justly proud of.

Because we are a Territory, people have questioned our right to appear before the Supreme Court. Though that question was not enlarged upon, it has arisen and sometime in the future could very easily if events work against us, be a threat.

Through statehood Hawaii throws open her doors to free exchange with the mainland of skilled workers. What could be better for Hawaii's economy than the existence in the Territory of skilled workers specially trained in their fields? These workers would feel free to come to Hawaii, leaving their State, for they would know that here they would possess the same opportunities and privileges which they leave behind. The people of the Territory have experienced during the war years, a military government. We had no representation in Congress which had the power of withdrawing this control. I doubt if Hawaii were a State, this military law would have been allowed to remain in control as long as it did.

I do not subscribe to the racial statements that are being raised in opposition to statehood. Opponents of statehood have claimed before this group and privately, that this Territory possesses a threatening power—the power of racial bloc voting. They say that these blocs

have the ability to control elections. They insist that if Hawaii is granted statehood these blocs will have the power of controlling the State.

Hawaii like many places on the mainland is composed of peoples of many racial ancestries. I have never known them to participate in racial bloc voting. As a matter of fact, they are divided on political matters. A good example of this is the fact that all racial groups are represented in both Republican and Democratic parties in the Territory. As to the opportunities which statehood holds for these blocs, I feel that there are none in excess of the opportunities presented as a Territory. Political blocs will exist until such time as our entire moral standard of living is reorganized. All races in the Territory have proven themselves good Americans—all have fought well in the war and will continue to uphold their government. These facts, gentlemen, have proven to me beyond a doubt that Hawaii deserves and needs statehood.

I hope you will accept my humble words in their sincerest sense.

Chairman LARCADE. Thank you very much. Any questions?

Delegate FARRINGTON. Sam, you are a student of what school?

Mr. VAN CULIN. Punahou.

Delegate FARRINGTON. You feel that you express the point of view of a majority of the student body?

Mr. VAN CULIN. I have stated that I speak for myself, and the Star Bulletin has stated that I speak not for the school. I would not venture to say as to how the student body feels on the subject of statehood, but I do insist that they are broadminded and that they feel that statehood would do the territory some good.

Representative ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, I'd like to say for the record that in my opinion Mr. Sam Van Culin is not only a great credit to his school but a great credit to himself and to his parents. I think he has made a really outstanding contribution to these hearings, and I don't think that if the future is to be entrusted to young men of his ability and spirit in Hawaii that the country will have anything to worry about.

Chairman LARCADE. I agree with you, Mr. Angell.

Representative ANGELL. You have received all of your education here in the Territory, have you?

Mr. VAN CULIN. With the exception of 2½ years upon the mainland, that was necessitated because of the war.

Representative ANGELL. But you were born—

Mr. VAN CULIN. And raised in the Territory and educated for 8 years, 7½ years of my life, at Punahou.

Representative ANGELL. I think, Mr. Chairman, this young man is a good exhibit that they have a fairly good educational system here in the islands.

Representative DELANEY. Have you discussed these problems, or the problem of statehood, with the students here in the classes that you attend?

Mr. VAN CULIN. Yes, as a matter of fact, our school forum, which is composed of a cross section of the students most interested in political affairs, discussed the subject of statehood today, and I have

gathered information from them and have spoken quite extensively with other youngsters.

Representative DELANEY. How long have you been back here on the island?

Mr. VAN CULIN. I returned to the island approximately 2 years ago, I forget the date exactly.

Representative DELANEY. Now you have had an opportunity to make your own observation and appraisal of the aptitude of boys, both on the mainland and here in the island, for acquiring an education. Is it your opinion that the boys of the islands compare favorably with the boys and girls on the mainland?

Mr. VAN CULIN. Indeed, I think they do, and in some cases I feel they exceed the intellectual ability.

Representative DELANEY. You wouldn't say that the students of this island are to a marked degree below the average of what you find on the mainland?

Mr. VAN CULIN. No.

Representative DELANEY. Thank you.

Chairman LARCADE. Any other questions? [No response.] Thank you very much, Mr. Van Culin. The next witness is Mr. Theodore Burgess.

(Mr. Van Culin withdraws, and Mr. Theodore Burgess takes the witness chair.)

Mr. THEODORE BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, and members of Congress, my name is Theodore Burgess. I am 24 years old. I have a small business here. I have been in the Territory about 3 years. I speak for myself. I am a veteran of this war, having been in the Army approximately 43 months. Of that time I spent about 18 months here, and the rest of the time was divided between the Cook Islands and the mainland. Originally I came from Jamaica, N. Y., which is the Democratic stronghold of Queens, and I'd like to say at this point that the people of Jamaica can elect their own representatives without any help from the people of Rochester. Also for the benefit of those who come up to speak against Territorial statehood aspirations on the ground that they have been discriminated against, I would like to say that these things have no bearing on statehood. In stating a statehood claim, the questions that are paramount are:

1. What is the attitude of the people, and
2. What is contributed by those who are affected?

The attitude of the people toward statehood is very favorable here; except for a small minority the people are unanimous for statehood. A few are for statehood with reservations, while others state their views publicly as to discriminations against them. I would like to say that 66 percent of the people of the United States in the Gallup Poll in 1940 wanted statehood for this Territory.

Everyone here realizes what American citizenship in its pure form means. It means freedom and justice. There is not a man who cannot agree that American citizenship in its true form is the greatest asset a man can have—a guarantee of freedom, a guarantee of justice and a guarantee of protection from the States themselves, all this plus the right to local self-government. This is why Hawaiians want American rather than English or French citizenship, not because of protection but because of what American citizenship means. The

question is, however, is America living up to the expectations Hawaii has of her better than none at all? Does America have the right to force Hawaii to support a government in which it has no voice? Does America have the right to limit the amount of goods we can send her? Does America have the right to induct members of our community into the armed forces without giving them full equalities? An answer to the second and third questions can be found in the Constitution of the United States.

Article I, section 3 of the Constitution states:

Representatives and direct taxes shall be apportioned among the several States which may be included within the Union.

Again, according to section 8, paragraph 1:

The Congress shall have the power to levy and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout the States.

In relation to this paragraph, we are not a State, and not a part of the United States for these purposes.

According to article 16, the Congress shall have power to levy and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States and without regard to any census or enumeration. This article could be interpreted to mean that Congress could levy taxes anywhere it pleases, but in view of the fact that no statement has been made repealing article I, section 3, this article must be deemed to mean that whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States means that among the several States Congress can levy taxes from whatever source derived without apportionment.

Why, then, is Hawaii made to pay taxes to America? According to section 9, paragraph 6, no preference shall be given by any regulation of commerce to parts of the State over those of another. However, Congress does levy sugar quotas on our industries here.

Now, gentlemen, I do not say that all these laws are interpreted incorrectly, but I do say that they are interpreted inconveniently, so that if the laws applying to taxation are correct, then the laws applying to restrictions on business are incorrect and vice versa.

For instance, if you recognize us as a State for purposes of taxation you must also recognize us as a State for purposes of trade. Whereas, if we are recognized as a Territory for purposes of trade, then we must also be recognized as a Territory for purposes of taxation.

It would seem from these things that our money is most welcome but our competition is not. Even during the war this attitude was apparent when it was found necessary for Hawaii to run ads in Washington newspapers to attain desperately needed housing, a shortage brought on by mainlanders, and which had already been paid for by taxation levied here.

And in relation to drafting our men, men who have no representation, who are forced to pay taxes to a government in which they have no vote, who are themselves discriminated against in trade relations between sister States, do the people of America think that they have a right to call upon these men here to help fight their battles without giving them equality? Does England set up draft boards throughout

its dominions? Does America think because Hawaii is smaller than she is that she has any more right to force her to contribute to her government than England had to force America? Or does America realize the true attitude of the majority of the American citizens here, and why they support America in the face of this discrimination?

People here want statehood because they want a voice in their government, because of the taxes they pay to the United States, because it was implied at annexation, because they do not want to see the American Army set up such a government as that set up by the military, where even our judges were threatened. Others want statehood to insure equal coverage by all laws, while others want to insure against discrimination in business.

Efforts have been made by mainlanders here to belittle Hawaii's part played in this war, whereas if the truth were known, Hawaii has contributed more than any State in the Union. Suppose Hawaii had been friendly to Japan. Is there anyone here who can argue that on the west coast people would have felt secure? Is there anyone who can doubt that the coastal cities would have been bombed and possibly destroyed? Is there anyone who can say the war might not have lasted a great deal longer, and that America might have been treated to war at its worst, with atrocities committed upon its own people?

Certainly, Hawaii admits that there are things that America has that we need here, and that America does give us trade, but we give to America so much more that there is no comparison. We give taxes, a protection for her homeland, plus a stronghold in the Pacific. So in this day there should be no question about America's need for Hawaii, and in justification of this position, Hawaii maintains it should have statehood now.

Chairman LARCADE. Any questions?

(No response.)

(Mr. Burgess withdraws, and Mr. F. J. De Clercq takes the witness chair.)

Chairman LARCADE. The next witness is Mr. F. J. De Clercq.

Mr. DE CLERCQ. Just about how much do you want to know from me? You have my name.

Chairman LARCADE. Yes.

Mr. DE CLERCQ. Well, I originally came to Hawaii in March 1917, and I have lived almost consistently ever since. I was away during part of the first World War, which I was a member of. And I'd like to say that it seems after each war that the United States has, it goes to quite an extent to give freedom to other countries and other people. It was quite anxious to give Panama and Cuba and the Philippines their freedom, and I think that charity begins at home. They ought to give their own people their freedom. And in the First World War we were told that we were fighting the war to end all wars, and we were going to give France, Belgium and Luxembourg, and over here we would appreciate the same freedom that they are giving to these other people. Now in this war, it is another freedom for everybody. We spent billions of dollars, sacrificed thousands of lives, and tens of thousands or hundreds of thousands of casualties in giving freedom to the Philippines and Korea, and all of these other subjugated countries that are going to get their freedom back like Alsace-Lorraine of the first war. And I am telling you that the people here would like

to enjoy some of that freedom here too. And I think they have earned it.

Delegate FARRINGTON. Do you favor statehood for Hawaii?

Mr. DE CLERCQ. Yes, but I favor statehood in this way: I think that a date should be set for it, not as far off as they did, of course, in the case of the Philippines, but I think 2 years in advance. It is going to take time for the Territory to whip itself into shape. It is concerned. Joe Farrington wouldn't want to be a Delegate to Congress then. He is going to be a Senator to Congress. [Laughter.] That's what everybody wants. And first, we want it far enough ahead so that Joe can complete this term of delectateship, and get in shape for senatorship. [Laughter.] But Joe's is all cut and dried. Don't be surprised. It takes time, because other things are going to have to be done. And I am going to tell you something that nobody has done so far, and I may be able to tell you because I can take the next boat away from here if I want to. I am not running for office and I am not in business any more, and I am not dependent upon the trade from any race or nationality, and I think I can tell you. And that is this: of course, it was true that the big bugaboo about granting statehood to Hawaii was the Japanese question. Well, it is true. Nobody knew. They just didn't know what the situation was going to be.

The Military Intelligence, I know, didn't know. The FBI, I know, didn't know. I know darn well they didn't know. I was a representative of the Star-Bulletin at the Schofield Barracks, the largest post that the Army ever maintained for more than 25 years. So I know a little bit about the situation. I knew what some of their battle plans were, and what their different alerts meant, and that sort of thing. And I even know what regiment was to be called out in case of sabotage or an attempted sabotage, and things like that, because I am an ex-service-man, and I was right there. And I think the big bugaboo about the Japanese question is just a bugaboo and nothing else, because in the last election here in the Territory, it was the Chinese and not the Japanese that we had trouble with among the voting elements. [Laughter.] And nobody can deny it because every politician here and every political worker and all the precinct workers and the newspapers and the editors brought it to the attention of the newspapers, and there were editorials and other matters that were published on that. And there was grief with the Chinese. It became so serious between the primary election and the general election that there were thousands of people just like myself that dropped the Chinese from their lists, and substituted other people, even some of us Republicans substituted Democrats rather than vote for the Chinese. [Laughter.] That is going pretty far, isn't it, Joe? There are two people here that can tell you something about it. On your way home, Joe can tell you something about it, and Judge Robertson here, I think, is pretty well acquainted with it and has some knowledge in regard to what we call plunking here on the ballot.

Chairman LARCADE. We use them in our States, too.

Mr. DE CLERCQ. What did you say?

Chairman LARCADE. We use it in our State, too.

Mr. DE CLERCQ. Well, it got so serious here that so many people who would ordinarily vote for certain Chinese switched their vote, with the result that there was nearly all of the Chinese that had been nominated

for the election that were dumped at the election, including some of the Chinese who had nothing to do but walk into office. It was like one of four supervisors, who was in office for many years, maybe 15 or 18 years. He was one of them. And it was from the house of representatives and such places.

I have discussed this over a period of years because I was a politician. I was the first one known ever to introduce children into campaigning for candidates. It took place 19 years ago last fall, and the older members here will remember very well the De Clercq sisters who campaigned. I had one daughter who was not quite 4 years old. Victor Houston, will you stand up just a minute please? The ex-Delegate to Congress, Victor Houston, will verify this, as well as Riley Allen in the Star-Bulletin, whom I saw here, and Joe Farrington, that one of our children took the soap box and delivered a political address on behalf of Victor Houston here, and she wasn't 4 years old. The other children started when they were 3 to 4½ years old in the campaign, and after that they went to California and went to school for quite awhile. But I think that you will find that Mr. Abner T. Longley, better known as Jack Longley, told you Sunday afternoon in Hilo—he is one of the big men of the Hawaiian Pineapple here and lives close to me at Wahiawa, and is very prominent in politics and one of the leading members of the Democratic central committee for many years—and he said he was for statehood, as I got it over the radio. He was for statehood, but said something will have to be done about the primary laws. And that has been discussed here a great deal. They have got to change the election laws, and they have got to do something to cut out this plunking.

Chairman LARCADE. Well, due to the fact that you have been a resident of this Territory for 17 years, you ought to be able to state whether it is your feeling whether or not this Territory is able to bear the responsibility of statehood.

Mr. DE CLERQ. I would say that it certainly is able to do so, that it handles its own governing powers right here in a very capable manner. And lots of times it could set an example to many States in the Union. And I'd like to say something at this time, a sort of an answer to maybe the Pearl Harbor gang, as you might refer to. [Laughter.] After I got out of the Army, after the First World War, I went back to my own stamping ground at Chicago, Ill. I went to work there for one of the largest advertising corporations in Chicago. We handled many products and advertised them nationally. We advertised one product and used 23 foreign-language newspapers in the city of Chicago. The other seven that we didn't use stormed our office and were very indignant that they didn't get a cut in it. So if you see that Chicago has 30 foreign-language newspapers, I guess they have immigration and alien problems to consider too. And I was very much surprised when I came back to Hawaii and found out what the circulation of the Star-Bulletin and the Advertiser was, to compare it with some of the foreign-language newspapers in Chicago. In other words, there were three Swedish foreign-language newspapers, and the smallest one had twice the circulation of the two American papers here. And the same was true of the three German papers. We used Greek papers and we used Italian and German and French and all the rest of them. And they certainly got along all right with their

conglomeration of people. And, as I say, since the war the Japanese language school has been abolished, and since they have been abolished in that 4 years' time there has been a decided pick-up in things American that shows that if Hawaii got busy and really did something to warrant statehood, I would say that it would make them very much better American communities.

I think some of the things that should be done is to change the election laws. And another thing is to abolish all language schools, Chinese, Korean, and Japanese language schools.

Chairman LARCADE. Well, that is the battle that you will have control over if you are admitted into statehood. The State would be able to pass its own laws controlling those.

Mr. DE CLERCQ. Where now they can't.

Chairman LARCADE. Thank you very much, sir. Any question?

Representative MILLER. No question.

Chairman LARCADE. Thank you for appearing before the committee. [Applause.]

Chairman LARCADE. The next and last witness is Mr. Arthur Rutledge. Give your full name and business and organization that you represent, and a brief synopsis of your background, Mr. Rutledge.

Mr. RUTLEDGE. All of it?

Chairman LARCADE. Well, comprehensive.

Mr. RUTLEDGE. That all pertains to this question?

Chairman LARCADE. How long have you been here?

Mr. RUTLEDGE. My name is Arthur A. Rutledge, A for Abraham. I have been here since 1938. I am employed by two labor unions.

Chairman LARCADE. Do you represent the labor unions in your appearance before this committee, or do you appear as a citizen and individual?

Mr. RUTLEDGE. I am appearing now to present the view of one organization, my own view, which I am satisfied—

Chairman LARCADE. What is the name of the organization that you represent?

Mr. RUTLEDGE. The Shore Warehousemen and Helpers' Union, affiliated with the A. F. of L. And as president of the Joint Council of Teamsters, representing 14 teamsters locals. I am satisfied that I represent their position, together with many other people in the community.

Chairman LARCADE. You may proceed.

Mr. RUTLEDGE. There has been very much made of this Japanese question, that, with the Big Five and aliens. So far as the Japanese question is concerned, I fail to see what is wrong with sending Mr. Yamamoto to Congress, or Mr. Hamashido or Kido or whoever we may decide through democratic procedures to elect to go there. Now, that is all right. And if Mr. Bilbo doesn't like it, that is just too bad, or other of his ilk. Now, if we see fit to send someone like that to Congress or to the Senate, that is our business. That comes under the heading of local autonomy. That is what we want. So if we get it, we will take care of it. Now, we've got people in the Territory here that are still carrying the banner, possibly unconsciously, for Hitler. We are told that Hitler is dead. Sometimes I think his spirit marches on. And right in our paradise. Some of the things that have been said here are shocking in view of what we proclaim

that we want, what this war was all about. What did we win? If we won the things we believe in, what is wrong with exercising them? What is wrong with sending people of our own choosing to Congress or elsewhere?

Now, insofar as this bloc voting is concerned, suppose they want somebody and they want to bloc vote for them? That is permitted under our election laws, because that is an inducement. We can bloc vote now. It is being done. It has been explained to you gentlemen that it was done in the last election. Some Democratic speaker in the last campaign, I think just talked through his hat. Some of the speakers talked through their hats. They said some things that other people took up. They told the Japanese people to be careful. They didn't have to be told that. They knew that the eyes of the world, you might say, were on them over here. They were doing their job. Everybody here was under a war tension. And, of course, no one likes to blame themselves. And there has always got to be a scapegoat. What better scapegoat is there? So it just kept on and on and it was taken up here. I don't say that the Japanese people are the leading light of the community. I have my own criticism of them. I think they are too complacent. I think they should have more leadership than the kind was presented here this evening. And I am satisfied that Mr. Kageyama, who has been sitting here and talked as fast as he did, would probably stand them off a bit.

Now, another question has come up about the Big Five. Well, I don't know. Maybe it is breaking my heart to see that even if it does give the Big Five sugar interests more bargaining power in Congress—and incidentally I worried about it and stayed up nearly all one night—well, sometimes you've got to go down the line with the boss. Sugar is our basic industry, and if the sugar interests do need bargaining power in Congress to bring about favorable legislation, well they may make a lot of money out of it, but if our unions are strong enough they will get a sandwich, too. I think so much for the Big Five, insofar as some of the people I know being worried about them taking over and having too much bargaining power. After all, we all have to do the voting. Now, in spite of what has been said, a good deal of influence is still in effect, to say the least, and emanating from the so-called Big Five. We, in labor, have got our troubles and we have gotten plenty of them. And I believe it is stretching the point a good deal when you gentlemen are told labor can take care of itself, can take care of its own end, and fight the Big Five, or what is left of it. It is my contention that they are very well organized now. They are much better organized than they have been for a long time. They have a council of employers here. They not only have the Big Five in but they have got two-hundred-and-thirty-some little ones right in with them. And our unions have to contend with them. So we have got our hands full.

Now, the question has come up, how is labor going to be affected under statehood? Will they have all the rights that they now enjoy under the Wagner Act? Will there be as many people covered? Well, look into that a bit. We will look into that a bit, and there wouldn't be as many people covered. However, we will have to learn to fight. Now, on the Japanese, assuming that they were doing all these things, if they are getting away with it under our govern-

ment as a Territory, then perhaps they would not be able to get away with it under statehood. Insofar as the fear, there is fear. Some people are afraid to get up and say they are against them. I talked to a blind man on the corner. I have been conducting a sort of a poll of my own. I asked the blind man, "What do you think about statehood?" He said, "What do you think?" I said, "I asked you first." "Well," he said, "I can't see." I said, "My name is Art Rutledge." "Oh," he told me. And he told me he kept a poll, too. He asked 30 people. Twenty-nine people, he told me, were against statehood. One of them was for it. I said, "Why do the 29 not want statehood?" "Oh," he said, "they mentioned the Big Five and the Japanese interests." I said, "Is that all?" And he said, "Well, that's all."

Now, there has been a lot of confusion. Both the Democratic and Republican Parties say that they have been for statehood for years. I say they have both been derelict in their duties. They should have educated the people as to how statehood would affect them. They should have taken some of the money that they spent in these big ads and gone on record and made definite commitments as to the kind of a constitution they believed in for this Territory under statehood. They should have made definite commitments as to the reapportionment here. Incidentally, that is something that they will still have plenty of time to do. It is a good idea. In that way people like our union members wouldn't say, as they did when we held a meeting, when one fellow said, "Well, the statehood, I don't know and I didn't know 2 years ago what Mr. Bush, my boss, told me to vote for statehood. I don't know what this statehood is all about." Incidentally, that was 1940, more than 2 years ago. "So we voted. What is statehood all about now? How much more pay are we going to get? How is it going to affect the people?" That is what they really want. I know when the plebiscite was handled, I saw a group of workers called together and their employer told them how long he had been their boss, how he had always treated them right. And in those days we didn't have so many unions. And, of course, they all went down and did as the boss said. They have learned better now. They have begun to think much more than they did before. Now, presently, there is a good deal of fear. Even the intelligent businessmen were afraid to sign their names. I understand there are 93 of them in the chamber of commerce poll who didn't want to sign their names. Now, I believe that Congress owes the people of the Territory an obligation. I think Congress owes us statehood because they promised it. They made a commitment. Now, I believe it is in your record that Hawaii is more capable of statehood now than some of the States who received statehood when they got it. And it can possibly do a better job now than some of the States are doing in the mainland.

I have listened this evening, as you gentlemen have, and have been here, and we have all listened to a gentleman and to several gentlemen from the various State clubs. Why, the very reason that they said they didn't want statehood shows that we should have statehood. They complained about Marshall Wright. Well, anybody anytime that he complains about a Republican, that is all right with me. But in their case, I have to point this out, that if they don't

like Marshall Wright, they should regret that they can't vote for him, that is, vote him out of office because he is in. It is just the same as if we would have a law enacted in Congress which applied to us. We can gripe all we want to about it just like the State-side guys. And there is nothing to do about it. Now, our people here have learned to get along with each other. The chances are if they could vote tomorrow and were given some of the records as to the feelings of some of the Congressmen and Senators, on racial issues, they will probably vote them out real quick. But the best thing they could do, feeling this way that we do here, is maybe send somebody over there that will give them a good argument on it.

Now, in the mainland you have found it necessary to enact a fair employment practice law. Why? Because discrimination existed there. You passed a law to protect your people in the mainland against it. We don't have such an act here. I hope we will get one in the next legislature. I believe in insurance. Now, then, if you had to pass an act over there, and your record shows that here there is no discrimination, I don't say there is no discrimination, but there is certainly much less than there is in any part of the country of the United States. Then for that reason alone the people here are suited for statehood. That is one of the reasons.

Now, many questions have come up. The man in the street wants to know what it is about. We discussed the question in our union. And our unions, to tell you gentlemen frankly, were taking a chance. Because we have got at the present time a fight on our hands for the very existence of the union, because there is a move by the employers to get us in on a conspiracy of theirs, wherein we will be required, as a result of signing an agreement, to do away with ourselves. But that is our fight. That is democracy in action. We have to fight them on end. We should get statehood. And if we should get statehood tomorrow we might be thrown for a loss. But our cause is just. The principle is right, and our unions will take care of themselves as they have done on the mainland, and they may get kicked around and fight back. So therefore I say, on the whole, that for the reasons that most people have advanced against statehood, I am for it. Recently I had been one way and another. But after hearing all of this, it appears to me that under statehood we would be able to set our democracy in motion. We would have more democracy than we have at present. We would have reapportionment, which is something both the Republicans and Democrats want except when they are in power, then they wouldn't give it to us. But I guess that is always true pretty near everything else. So, gentlemen, realizing that everybody is pretty tired, I am trying extra hard not to unwind myself entirely, because I can go for quite a while when I get started.

Chairman LARCADE. May I ask you, sir, if your organization has taken a vote on this question?

Mr. RUTLEDGE. Your question is timely. It reminds me of a point I wanted to make. Last week the president of the Central Labor Council I don't believe stated the position of the American Federation of Labor clearly. We have decided at our Central Labor Council meeting to refer that matter to the individual unions involved and let them have a free discussion on it. Our teamsters' unions have done that. I was told here to bring up the question, told to come

here and bring up the question that was raised in our meeting. And incidentally, our union, you may be interested to know—I know it would be of interest to many unions affiliated with our International Brotherhood of Teamsters in the mainland—you will be very much surprised to know that of the four local unions, two of them—the officers of two of them—are all of Japanese ancestry. The other two unions have all but two of Japanese ancestry. One union and another one, I think, is evenly divided. So on that point, getting back to this Japanese question again, our dairy workers' union here claims the best record in the Territory of Hawaii in the long run in weigh points on the question of absenteeism from their jobs during the war.

Chairman LARCADE. In your answer to my question, did you have reference to Mr. Ortiz, who appeared before this committee?

Mr. RUTLEDGE. Yes.

Chairman LARCADE. Do you belong to the same union, the same organization?

Mr. RUTLEDGE. Yes, and it was at my insistence that we didn't take a positive position and refer the matter to the various locals, because we might have free discussion and thereby give it serious consideration.

Chairman LARCADE. Speaking for yourself, you are already in favor of statehood?

Mr. RUTLEDGE. For the reasons I have stated. For the reasons that most people are opposed, because those reasons—it is necessary that we have a full discussion on these things if you will exercise your rights that go with statehood. We meet among ourselves and choose sides, three, four, or five sides, whatever we may have, and decide it. The best organized one will be on top. They do the right thing. They stay on top. If they don't, out they go. Such is our democracy. And, incidentally, my understanding from reading the newspapers is that they are trying to do the same thing in Japan, and we are encouraging it. So how about a little statehood here?

Chairman LARCADE. Are you in favor of statehood?

Mr. RUTLEDGE. For the reasons that I have mentioned.

Chairman LARCADE. You wouldn't care to make a definite statement then?

Mr. RUTLEDGE. Yes.

Chairman LARCADE. You are all in favor of statehood?

Mr. RUTLEDGE. Yes. And furthermore, I may add this, to make it clearer, because I believe that we will get statehood not immediately, within possibly the next 5 years, and furthermore, I am a little disturbed on whether or not Congress—and I think I am reflecting the thought of a lot of people—whether or not Congress will seriously consider extending the boundaries of the continental United States 2,400 miles out.

Chairman LARCADE. Well, that is not a matter under consideration before the committee. I am trying to elicit from you a reply to a direct question. I would like to find out whether or not you personally, or your organization whom you represent here, are in favor of statehood.

Mr. RUTLEDGE. I personally am in favor of statehood for the reasons stated before.

Chairman LARCADE. No; I don't want to qualify that. I want to find out whether you came here to testify for statehood or are you against it?

Mr. RUTLEDGE. I think it is clear that the answer must be yes.

Chairman LARCADE. Thank you. Any other questions?

Representative MILLER. No questions.

Chairman LARCADE. Thank you very much for appearing, sir.

(At this point there were filed in the records the following: A letter from Mr. S. M. Castle, (Statement No. 23) a letter from Mrs. S. J. Cooke. (Statement No. 24.) There was no objection.)

Chairman LARCADE. Now, Mr. Farrington, would you like to make an observation at this time?

Delegate FARRINGTON. Yes. Mr. Chairman, I believe I should say for the benefit of those of you who are here tonight that the chairman of this committee has expressed to me his very deep gratification at the large attendance and the lively interest in this question. I am pretty sure that he expresses the sentiments of other members of the committee when he says that the response probably was far beyond what was originally anticipated. I'd like to point out that in the opening of this proceeding he called for a showing of hands of those who wanted to speak in behalf of statehood, and got the names of nine persons, and also a showing of hands of those who wanted to speak in opposition and got the names of five persons. I think it is interesting to point out that of those who spoke in support of statehood, every one is a resident of this Territory and all but one, I believe, is a voter. Of the five who spoke in opposition to statehood, there is only one who is a resident of this Territory, and no one was a voter. The only resident speaking in opposition was a minor. The observation has been made that this probably reflects rather accurately the sentiment of Hawaii on this question. I wish to add finally that insofar as I was in considerable measure responsible for bringing this committee to Hawaii to examine this question, that I am especially grateful to you who have contributed so much of the success of these proceedings. I believe the committee will return to Washington with a record of the Territory of Hawaii and all of its activities, that it will be without parallel in our history. We will have brought the case for statehood up to date. I believe that we will have all the facts that are necessary for the Members of Congress to give this question the serious consideration that it deserves.

I wish also to express particularly my deep gratitude to the members of this committee for the thoughtful attention they have given to our interests. I have said in a number of occasions, and I want to say here that they have come to the islands at great personal sacrifice. Each one of them represents a large and an aggressive constituency whose members are constantly making demands on their time and energy. Their primary interests, naturally, are with those people, as my interests are with you. Now, they had to leave Washington at a very crucial time. The House of Representatives met yesterday, and I believe this week is hearing the President, and soon will receive the program of legislation that must be enacted before June. In consequence of their absence from their homes and from Washington,

they will return to a mountain of work. And they will receive innumerable demands. And in addition, they will have the responsibility of presenting to the House Committee on the Territories the results of these deliberations. I feel, therefore, that they should know that not only I but, I am sure, the people of this Territory are deeply grateful to them. They are the first members of a Committee on the Territories of either the Senate or the House to come to these islands in 8 years. I hope, and I believe, that events will prove that these proceedings will be of great historic importance. And that out of them we will realize the ambition which I am sure the great and vast majority of you share with me. I thank you sincerely. [Applause.]

Chairman LARCADE. Ladies and gentlemen, the hour is too late to start speechmaking. Any one of the members of this group can probably speak to you for quite a long time. So without going into any oration, I wish to thank you, to thank the Delegate from Hawaii for his complimentary remarks, and I wish to announce that the committee will adjourn until Thursday morning at 10 o'clock. The meeting is adjourned.

(The meeting adjourned at 11:45 p. m.)

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII

FRIDAY, JANUARY 17, 1946

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE TERRITORIES,
Honolulu, Hawaii, T. H.

The committee met at 10 a. m. Hon. Henry D. Larcade (chairman) presiding.

Present: Representative Henry D. Larcade, Louisiana, chairman; Representative James J. Delaney, New York, member; Representative George P. Miller, California, member; Representative Homer D. Angell, Oregon, member; Delegate Joseph R. Farrington, Hawaii, member; Irwin W. Silverman, Esq., chief counsel for House Territories Subcommittee.

Chairman LARCADE. The meeting will now come to order. The committee is prepared to resume its hearings.

At this time I desire to ask the Honorable Joseph R. Farrington, Delegate from Hawaii, a member of the full committee of the Territorial house of representatives to preside.

(At this time Delegate Farrington takes the chair.)

Delegate FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, and ladies and gentlemen, I might say for the benefit for those present that the proceedings have been delayed only because we have certain problems in connection with our transportation back to the coast that had to be dealt with immediately, as we have to get back to Washington by Tuesday at the latest, and possibly by Monday.

Briefly the purpose of this meeting is to hear the testimony of Senator Campbell. It gives me great pleasure now to call upon Senator Alice Kamokila Campbell to make her presentation.

Senator CAMPBELL (Hawaii). Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, and our Delegate to Congress, Aloha. I am Mrs. Alice Kamokila Campbell, residing at 36 Old Pali Place, Honolulu, T. H.

I am an American citizen, born in Honolulu, Island of Oahu. My mother was Caucasian-Hawaiian, born in Lahaina, Maui. My father was Caucasian, born in Londonderry, Ireland. He was one of the early pioneers of these islands, but was neither missionary nor "Big Five."

I was educated in the private schools of this Territory when it was a monarchy and later a republic. I also attended the College of Notre Dame, then at San Jose, Calif.

I was former Democratic National Committeewoman; my term of office as Democratic Senator from Maui County will expire in November of this year, 1946.

I am definitely against statehood for Hawaii in any form and at any time and demonstrated my sentiments on the matter by being the

only dissenting vote in the past session of our 1945 Territorial legislature.

I am not seeking any political office, nor am I affiliated with any political party. I appear before you gentlemen as an American believing in free speech and democracy and speak from the heart and soul of all Hawaii.

Speaking on the subject of statehood for Hawaii, I do not feel that particularly during this period of world adjustment and for several years thereafter, when we will be undergoing the reactions of our country's decisions, that we should forfeit the traditional rights and privileges of the natives of our islands for a mere thimbleful of votes in Congress, that we, the lovers of Hawaii from long association with it, should sacrifice our birthright for the greed of alien desires to remain on our shores, that we should satisfy the thirst for power and control of some inflated industrialists and politicians who hide under the guise of friends of Hawaii, yet still keeping an eagle eye on the financial and political pressure button of subjugation over the people in general of these islands.

The Territory of Hawaii is destined to play an increasingly significant part in the economic and political life and defense of the Nation. It has contributed much to national enrichment and will contribute much more due to its geographical location today. Both its difficulties and its benefits affect in their final reactions the well-being of every American citizen; furthermore, Hawaii is the focal point of our western defense and the Army and Navy should at all times be an important factor in any decision.

On a purely dollar-and-cents basis, annexation has proven a profitable business transaction for the Federal Government and the Territory has made a larger annual contribution to the Federal Treasury than it receives in Federal expenditures and its annexation cost the United States nothing. With all that, I still feel it is not sufficient grounds on which we of Hawaii should forego our individual identity. If in the past, Congress might have appeared cruel or indifferent to some of our needs or whims, let us at least be fair to the Members of Congress and realize that conservative scrutiny by Congress on all matters must be made with an eye and ear for protection, not only of Hawaii but of the 48 States of the Union, against any danger of foreign aggression.

The report of the subcommittee of the House of Representatives Committee on Territories which visited Hawaii and held extensive hearings throughout the archipelago in 1935 declared:

Your subcommittee found the Territory of Hawaii to be a modern unit of the American Commonwealth, with a political, social, and economic structure of the highest type. Hawaii's economic standards are high, with an industrial and agricultural development forming a sound base for the continued growth of the Territory.

Is this not a natural result of an American community where civic pride abounds and where no aspirations for statehood exist? If certain groups in our island paradise are dissatisfied with conditions existing today in Hawaii as a Territory, then let them go to any of the 48 States and live. I am sure none of you gentlemen would refuse them entry.

The financial pressure of the Big Five, numerical superiority of the Japanese in Hawaii, and reapportionment as to the organic act, seem

to be the three disturbing issues in our arguments for and against statehood. All three have been a matter of great concern to people in all walks of life in the Territory, and well it might be.

The Big Five, or sugar interests of the islands are in themselves a powerful financial and political group. They and their associates are as keen a group of businessmen as can be found in any part of the world. Facts and figures show this without going into lengthy arguments. All over these islands the influence of the Big Five is felt through some channel or other, sometimes kindly, other times to the point of Hitlerism. I would like to relate two instances that came under my personal observation.

The first was at the time one of our Army airports was under construction. The construction company was short of labor and appealed to one of our ranchers for some of his cowboys, who at the time were receiving \$60 monthly plus perquisites such as housing, lights, perhaps "poi", etc. Five of the ranch boys were employed and drew a substantial wage as truck drivers. At the end of the first month the boys enthusiastic over the amount of their check showed it to their employer, the ranch owner; he asked them to endorse it and in return he made out a check on the ranch for the usual \$60. This occurred the second month also, after which two of the boys inquired of me if the boss could do that. I immediately reported it to the FBI because of Federal funds being involved. From that time on, the boys received in place of the Big Five \$60 monthly, a Federal check for from \$150 to \$200.

Another instance which was pathetic is as follows:

There was a young Portuguese boy with a wife and two small children. The young man had contracted tuberculosis and could not stand any hard work. No work being available for him here he went to one of the outside islands leaving his wife in Honolulu to run his small restaurant business. He found work as a night watchman on one of the Big Five plantations. His illness grew worse and special care was needed for which he felt he could get by being nearer to his family where he and his wife could budget their problems together and at the same time he could receive hospitalization. He obtained a release from the plantation signed "without prejudice" and immediately booked to return to Honolulu. The plantation, in the meantime, was not able to fill his place because of the scant remuneration, so they went down to the Hawaiian Airlines and canceled his reservation, then demanded he return his release card. I told him to say he had given his release to me and I had misplaced it. They immediately issued him a new release marked "without prejudice." The incident, however, closed with the producing of his first release, a doctor's orders for immediate removal from his position and hospitalization in the Queen's Hospital. Today this young man is the picture of health, and happy with his own loved ones.

To most of us, this octopus of power represents progressive Hawaii, but that is no reason why we should permit them to walk off with everything in the islands to lay in the lap of Congress.

The Big Five are not alone in this power of control. There has come into the over-all picture, outside capital and independent financial giants who also wave the magic wand.

Before venturing out on another giant labor project the sugar interests and their agencies should check up on where all the cheap

Japanese labor has disappeared to that they imported. I feel that they are definitely responsible for the serious condition of the Japanese question today in this Territory. To think that on top of our congested condition that these same interests are advocating the importation of 9,000 Filipino immigrants.

I am definitely opposed to it because they would not improve the standard of living conditions. In fairness to the present Filipino people here who have worked so diligently to bring themselves up to the normal standard of our community, we should not jeopardize their opportunity and reputation by the introduction of a class of Filipinos with lower standards due to lack of education.

Congress would be doing Hawaii and the Philippines the greatest favor and justice in allowing immediate citizenship to the Filipinos.

The Big Five will always represent power in money, control of industry, and indirect control of politics until we, who are against such principles, rebel by taking action.

The Chinese in Hawaii are now in their third and fourth generation and are far advanced in their Americanization. The Japanese are largely in their second and third generation with Shintoism still deeply impregnated into their very blood stream; due to this condition, the assimilation of American ways and ideals will take longer in taking root. Immigration from both these sources has long been discontinued; the Chinese, by the Exclusion Act of 1900, the Japanese, by the gentlemen's agreement of 1908, confirmed by the Exclusion Act of 1924. The Filipinos, the latest comers, were barred from further immigration by the Independence Act of 1934.

Racial prejudice has existed in Hawaii to some extent for several years but has gained momentum since World War II; one of the main reasons being that those of this community and some of the mainland have inflated the ego of the Americans of Japanese ancestry through overindulgence of publicity, which to me must be embarrassing at times. One would think these newly labeled Americans had fought as aliens for our country and besides won the war for us. Let us all be fair to everyone in the service and in particular to those who have received the ravages of actual combat. Our boys fought as Americans and did a grand job. Let these A. J. A.'s be put on the same grounds of patriotism. It will make better Americans of them. Racial tolerance as you on the mainland term it is what we call in Hawaii, the spirit of "Aloha," a sentiment in the islands which has been much abused and taken advantage of. The more the general public in Hawaii become educated to the real conditions of this Territory, the faster racial tolerance will diminish.

The Japanese situation in the Territory is a serious menace to good American government. I say this not in a spirit of racial prejudice but based on the knowledge of statistics gathered from the different Territorial departments.

I would like to clear my position on the racial issue. To me you are either an American or you are not. In my employ today I have an alien maid who has been with me for 40 years. I respect her traditional rights and she in turn respects mine. I would not have it otherwise. And, may I add, that I would not trade "Naka" for all the money in the United States Treasury. But let us in Hawaii face

facts squarely and think and act as free Americans. This is no time for pussyfooting.

A brief analysis of accompanying graphic chart and statistical data relative to the racial composition of the entire population will explain to you why it is imperative to cut down the entire numerical, financial, and political superiority of the Japanese for the good of the entire community.

I have produced a chart for you gentlemen to take back to Congress, if you wish. [Exhibit No. 75.]

In the meantime, I will touch on the analysis and the substance of what it means. I wish to read this for the benefit of my audience:

MEMORANDUM: STATISTICS TAKEN FROM TERRITORIAL TREASURER'S REPORT FROM 1910 TO 1934, INCLUSIVE

No one can deny their impregnable financial position.

		Estimated population	Number of accounts	Amount of deposits
1910:				
Japs.....		79,663	552	\$98,819.66
Chinese.....		21,698	881	289,699.59
Hawaiians.....		38,584	2,359	232,329.33
All others.....		51,964	8,642	3,676,070.99
Total.....		191,909	12,404	4,296,919.57
1920:				
Japs.....		110,000	13,778	1,970,609.94
Chinese.....		22,800	4,788	1,352,477.21
Hawaiians.....		39,260	9,819	814,488.40
Portuguese.....		25,000	6,006	2,384,175.57
All others.....		66,606	17,271	9,286,066.99
Total.....		263,666	51,662	15,807,778.11
1930:				
Japs.....		140,670	56,125	9,053,404.69
Chinese.....		25,750	16,641	4,097,775.00
Hawaiians.....		48,764	21,325	1,845,612.70
Portuguese.....		29,717	11,542	3,203,382.07
All others.....		117,550	56,978	15,742,182.73
Total.....		362,451	162,611	33,942,357.19

	Estimated population	Number of accounts	Percent	Amount of deposits
1934:				
Japs.....	154,662	60,835	24.06	\$8,439,999.64
Chinese.....	26,989	16,389	10.60	3,717,490.19
Hawaiians.....	56,215	17,828	3.20	1,121,794.13
Portuguese.....	29,236	11,997	9.48	3,324,477.17
Filipinos.....	56,700	19,323	11.23	3,942,588.21
All others.....	55,146	36,021	41.43	14,535,755.22
Total.....	378,948	162,393	100.00	35,082,104.56

The official tabulation of votes cast in the Territorial general election on November 3, 1942, was as follows:

Votes registered..... 85,292
 Votes cast..... 63,359

The total population of the Territory, estimated by the Board of Health, Bureau of Vital Statistics, for July 1, 1940, was as follows:

Citizens..... 344,841
 Noncitizens..... 81,813
 Total..... 426,654

Of the 344,841 citizens the break-down on racial nativity is as follows:

	Citizens	Noncitizens		Citizens	Noncitizens
Hawaiian.....	14,359	-----	Japanese.....	121,312	36,678
Part-Hawaiian.....	50,470	-----	Korean.....	4,517	2,337
Puerto Rican.....	8,322	-----	Filipino.....	17,109	35,498
Caucasian.....	73,464	-----	All others.....	807	30
Portuguese.....	30,236	2,681			
Chinese.....	24,245	4,589	Total.....	344,841	81,813

Total attendance at public schools.....	192,104
Total of Japanese at schools.....	46,418
Total of Japanese at private schools.....	4,161
Total of Japanese students.....	50,579
Number of citizens of Japanese ancestry.....	121,312
Number of Japanese students under 21 years.....	50,579
Number of Japanese eligible to vote.....	70,733
Number of Japanese registered voters.....	27,107
Total number of unregistered voters.....	43,626
Total registered voters in 1942.....	85,292
Deduct Japanese voters.....	27,107
Total of non-Japanese voters.....	58,185
Total of Japanese eligible voters.....	70,733

¹ Department of Public Instructions, Territory of Hawaii, report of Territorial public schools, all districts, all counties of Territory, ending Dec. 20, 1940.

For your particular information, the statistics of 1940, from the Bureau of Vital Statistics, showed this amazing and very outstanding fact.

There were 143,631 more Japanese than Hawaiians.

There were 141,977 more Japanese than all others.

There were 129,156 more Japanese than Chinese.

There were 125,073 more Japanese than Portuguese.

There were 123,626 more Japanese than Caucasian.

There were 107,520 more Japanese than part Hawaiians.

There were 105,383 more Japanese than Filipinos.

Now, just let your mind wander and then try to picture for yourself, what such an overwhelming majority (40,000 of whom are enemy aliens) can do to the economic welfare and political life of the unfortunate minorities.

From the graphic chart (exhibit No. 75) no one can deny the Japanese numerical superiority, and given another 25 years, there is no telling how serious a situation this Territory will be faced with. At the present moment this menace is already apparent in all lines of activity, private and public. Take a quick glance in our stores, offices, city and county offices, Territorial offices, and even in some of the Federal agencies, in barber shops, meat and vegetable markets, gasoline stations, contract work, carpentry, masonry, and other trades too numerous to mention. Let us without equivocation acknowledge that the very food with which our bodies are nourished is from the hands of the Japanese. They are in the majority of our commercial

fisheries today because the Hawaiians and other groups cannot compete with them. They are our vegetable growers, hog raisers and domestic help. It is obvious from the foregoing that in due time they will get a definite hold on the islands politically and economically and who can say whether or not to the detriment of American democracy in the islands.

It is about time that we Americans became more intelligently aware of this existing possibility, and take precautional measures before they never can be taken.

The Army and Navy have gone to great effort and cost to make Oahu a Gibraltar of the Pacific, and we cannot afford to assume the risk of a few disloyal members of this Japanese group who may be willing to betray our military secrets and bring disgrace to the many other loyal members of their group.

I hold no prejudice or blame on the group as a whole, but merely wish to point out that a dangerous possibility could exist, where a few treacherous members may conceal themselves in friendly disguise as carpenters and other tradesmen on our military reservation.

You might ask why do you feel that way toward the Japanese. The answer is simple enough. Who designated the important targets on December 7, 1941, such as Hickam Field guard house, on which the air-raid siren was located, as their first target? Who pointed out such other places as the hangars, ammunition warehouses, and other important military objectives? You might also ask, "Why do you feel it was some member that were members of this group?" The silk advertisement that appeared in our local newspapers is one sample, and the disclosure of the radar station on Haleakala by Tokyo Rose, is another, and other special cases as may be disclosed in the Pearl Harbor investigation will also bear this out.

You may ask how would statehood affect our defense system. I need only refer you to the military authorities, who, I am sure, have definite views on the subject. But every candidate, running for Territorial, city and county of Honolulu, or outside island county office, his fear of Japanese bloc voting, and the Chinese plunking, is not a mere dream. It is such a reality that in the campaign of 1944 I referred in some of my remarks as Democratic National Committee woman to the issues having experienced their effect in my own campaign for Democratic senator 2 years previously. The fear of the Democratic Party and the pressure brought to bear on the chairman of the Territorial Central Committee as well as the Democratic National Committeemen by those two groups, forced them publicly to insult me on the Democratic platform, by not allowing me to speak after I had appeared.

These same two men went so far as to telephone to my county and tell the campaign manager not to allow me to speak, because of the resentment of those groups to my statements. They were on the spot as to the way that they would vote at the coming election.

Another striking example of what the Japanese vote can do is shown when I was running for senator from Maui County on the Democratic ticket in the 1942 campaign and experienced the fear not only of the Big Five control but of the effect of the Japanese bloc voting. In Maui County, the essence of the Big Five and the Republican Party are combined in the family of the Baldwins. It was a

foregone conclusion that any Baldwin candidate was elected, even before the elections. I was not permitted to enter any plantation for speech making. So I had to campaign in the dark hours after curfew. I finally crawled into one of their largest Japanese camps. I contacted a young Japanese boy, and explained my situation. I left him on his assurance that he would try his best, and report to me later. This was 2 weeks before the general election. After curfew hours, the night before the general election, the same young man appeared at my cottage to say, "You are going to be our next senator, because I have 4,000 Japanese votes guaranteed." And, gentlemen, he produced the goods. I was Maui County's next senator.

The democracy for which our men and boys fought and died in World War II must be defined to this Territory in no uncertain terms, as soon as it is humanly possible. This is essential for the preservation of a peaceful condition in Hawaii.

I give this striking example to show how forceful this element of allegiance to alien parentage is. Two weeks before November 10, 1945, I had daily radio and newspaper announcements made, stating that I wanted to get in touch with all veterans of World War II who had seen and been in actual combat, and invited them to be my guest at a real traditional reception, feast, and entertainment, regardless of race, color, or creed. The invitation covered all islands; transportation expenses to be borne by me. From the time of the third radio announcement, telephone calls of inquiry poured in, mostly from AJA's. They were in this vein: "Senator Campbell, I am so-and-so, one of the veterans from the One Hundredth Battalion, or the Four Hundred Forty-Second Infantry Regiment," as the case may be. "We have just heard your radio announcement, and in talking to a group of our people we are informed that you have no use for the Japanese, and had publicly said so at a political meeting. Your statement was that we Japanese were on the spot. Is that true?" My answer was, "Yes, young man, I did say it, in warning to you people, and will continue to say it, because I mean it. If you Japanese don't care to come to my party, you can make it conspicuous by your absence, and I will feel Hawaii should be more on the alert than before December 7, 1941. Good-by."

Gentlemen, there was not one AJA there that night. I ask you Americans in this Territory: Where is the democracy these AJA's fought for?

With relation to taxes, it was not until the latter part of 1935, when the gross income tax was put into effect, that the Japanese actually begun to pay their just share of the tax burdens which were formerly paid for by the others. For example, the total net income tax by corporations and individuals in 1936 amounted to \$3,952,903, whereas the gross income tax netted \$3,524,373. In 1940 the total net income from corporations and individuals amounted to \$2,011,174, but the gross income tax netted \$4,957,854. It is safe to assume that about 40 percent of this new tax comes from the Japanese element, who never before had paid one cent of taxes, while the remaining 60 percent can be distributed among the other minorities.

These are figures taken from schedule 3, statement of tax collections of the entire Territory, from 1933 to 1941, Territorial tax office.

I was asked to submit some examples of home exemption:

Land value-----	\$900
Dwelling-----	600
Not taxable-----	<u>¹ 1,500</u>
Land value-----	1,000
Dwelling-----	2,500
Total-----	<u>3,500</u>
Not taxable-----	<u>1,500</u>
Total-----	<u>² 2,000</u>
Land value-----	2,000
Dwelling-----	3,000
Total-----	<u>5,000</u>
Maximum exemption-----	<u>3,250</u>
Taxable-----	<u>1,725</u>
Land value-----	5,000
Dwelling-----	10,000
Total-----	<u>15,000</u>
Exempt-----	<u>3,250</u>
Amount taxable-----	<u>11,750</u>

¹ Fully exempted.

² $\frac{1}{2}$ of this \$2,000, or \$1,000 is taxable.

(Providing home is not rented and no business is carried on in the home. A home built on leased land gets no home exemption whatever.)

On the matter of reapportionment, after we received our annexation, it is effectual in making the islands an integral part of the United States. With the passage of the organic act, that became absolutely settled; the decision of the Supreme Court established that fact.

In April 1900 Congress passed an act to provide a government for the Territory of Hawaii, which is known as the organic act, under which this purely American Territory now is governed. I sincerely question if we have adhered to it. Hawaii since 1910, has been living under an un-American system of government. The sugar oligarchy, dominating Republicans in control of our legislature, has since 1910 openly defied the laws of the United States and the mandatory provisions of the organic act, to the extent that since then we have not received fair representation in the legislature in the formulation and the making of our laws.

The organic act of 1900 specifically states, under sections 30 to 33, that representation in the senate shall be 15. Under sections 35 and 39 of the organic act it states representation in the house of representatives shall be 30. But in section 55 of the organic act, it provides among other powers and duties of the legislature, that the legislature, at its first regular session, after the census enumeration shall be ascertained, and from time to time thereafter, shall reapportion the membership in the senate and house of representatives, among the senators and representatives on the basis of population in each of the said districts, who are citizens of the Territory.

The Hawaii Equal Rights Commission, in a brief summary of facts prepared by them for the information and convenience of the 1937

Joint Congressional Committee on Hawaii, says, "This has never been done, and the representation in 1937 legislature was the same as that as provided originally in the organic act."

And still, in the 1945 session of the legislature, the situation remained the same.

I ask you gentlemen, under such conditions, is it stupidity, defiance of the law, or Big Five influence? And then they want statehood.

Also in the organic act, section 67, Congress provides that the Governor shall be responsible for the faithful execution of the laws of the United States, and of the Territory of Hawaii. Each Governor of the Territory of Hawaii, since the year 1910, has been aware of, and has had his personal attention called to, the refusal of the various legislatures to pass reapportionment legislation as required by the mandatory provisions of the act of Congress. Each Governor has failed, neglected, and refused to take any action to obtain information for legislative use upon which to base and pass proper legislation for reapportionment, as required by said act of Congress although all of our Governors have had at their command and disposal the expenditures of large sums of money for public emergency purposes. Each Governor during his term of office has acquiesced in the neglect and refusal of the various legislatures to pass reapportionment legislation, and has also acquiesced in the fraudulent and illegal control of the said various legislatures by the large sugar-plantation interests in the first, second, third, and sixth senatorial and representative districts on the islands of Hawaii, Maui, and Kauai, through their financial and political control of a minority of the citizen population on the Territory of Hawaii residing in said districts.

It is submitted that every call issued from the Governor's office or the Secretary of the Territory's office for the election of senators and representatives from the various senatorial and representative districts from and after the year 1910 to date here of having numerical strength more than that required in accordance with the provisions of section 55 of the said act of Congress was and is null and void; that therefore said elections were null and void, and all of said legislators so elected were illegally elected, and the alleged laws passed by the proceedings of said legislators are illegal and void.

In other words, in the financial and political power in these islands have forced the innocent, law-abiding citizens of Hawaii into this predicament. Now, let them get us out of it, without crying on the shoulders of Congress for statehood in order to cover up their ill doings.

It is to laugh at the clever way the Honolulu Chamber of Commerce has attempted to put over its statehood resolution. I particularly call attention to paragraph 3 of the resolution: "Whereas the people of Hawaii, pursuant to the provisions of said Organic Act, have created, developed, and maintained for a period of approximately 45 years an orderly and efficient government in and for the Territory of Hawaii." Visiting friends, we of Hawaii get this every day. Ask them how do they account for the condition of nonadherence to the Organic Act relative to reapportionment.

Members of the greatest law making body in the world, friends of Hawaii, the Congress of the United States of America, in humble simplicity I lay my Hawaii, the most precious of all your earthly

possessions before you; guard her from the selfish aspirations of strangers to her shores. She is still young in the knowledge of worldly conditions and to transplant her from her native environments into the cold earth of foreign atmosphere would be national suicide.

I trust her implicitly in your powerful but generous hands. Spare her the embarrassment of a divided country. She may well be a credit to America, her mother by adoption. Let not her aggressors confuse you by their clever words and deeds.

You have heard my testimony in the language of unadulterated truth. Take it, and absolve it into the very marrow of your bones.

Please take this message back to Congress: Hawaii and Kamokila ask nothing else but to be left alone. We are happy always in the thought that Congress has protected us in the past. America needs us more today; therefore, her protection will be that much greater I am sure. In leaving let me say: God bless our wonderful America. Aloha.

Chairman FARRINGTON. Senator Campbell, I wish to thank you on behalf of the committee for the frank statement of your point of view on this matter. It has been so ably presented, I am quite sure you will be willing to answer whatever questions we desire to ask.

Senator CAMPBELL. I will try.

Chairman FARRINGTON. In inviting you to present your views to the committee, the chairman gave, as one of his reasons for doing so, the fact that in 1940, prior to the plebiscite, you issued a statement strongly supporting statehood for Hawaii, and he said that he wanted to know, or we would like to know, your reasons for changing your mind. I am sure you have no objection to the introduction of that statement into the record at this time.

Senator CAMPBELL. No. I have nothing to hide.

Chairman FARRINGTON. You recall very well the circumstances of that. If there is no objection I will introduce the statement into the record at this time.

Representative DELANEY. As long as it is the same statement.

Chairman FARRINGTON. She can look it over, if she likes.

(The statement inserted in the record by Delegate Farrington follows.)

"Do you favor statehood for Hawaii?"

This is one of the most important public questions we have ever had to face.

The answer, yes or no, may affect the destiny of Hawaii for all time to come.

For those who can foresee the benefits to be derived for Hawaii as a State in the great Republic of the United States, there is nothing more to be said pro or con.

But for those whose heart and mind are set against statehood for reasons based on prejudice, rather than ideals, those are the people of Hawaii who should be pitied rather than condemned.

Up to 2 weeks ago I was one of those strongly opposed to statehood, but as time drew nearer for a written declaration of my decision I began to doubt my sincerity and true sense of justice for Hawaii.

It made me think and think seriously and to analyze my reason for and against statehood. It concerned the land of my birth, the land of birth of my children and grandchildren.

I had to argue with myself from two standpoints—through two hearts—mine was the native-born heart remade American, the childrens' were hearts born American. They represented the future of American and should be given all the privileges of their native land as full fledged American citizens. I represented the part of an unknown American.

I found my reasons had no logical foundation, that through prejudice and fear I was dimming my vision for all future benefits not only to Hawaii but to my children and their children.

I decided American freedom was based on American ideals and not on alien prejudice, or false personal emotions.

Those against statehood have three fundamental objections:

First. Why should we of Hawaii allow Congress, the haoles and the Big 3 or 5 of Hawaii, in other words, "Hawaii's Wall Street," to force statehood upon us for their own selfish reasons?

Second. The haoles (whites) have taken enough away from the Hawaiians and Hawaii, and if we have statehood, they will take what little is left and where are we?

Third. The great oriental question. What is going to happen to Hawaii when the Japanese get into power?

If my position in this community, my reasoning, and my decision can assist those who are indifferent and against statehood, I stand before you tonight to give from the bottom of my heart all that I know and am looking toward the future for, as an American voting "Yes" on the secret ballot for statehood at the plebiscite in November.

Let us take up the objections to statehood in the order before mentioned:

In my many words tonight I am not only going to speak my part but at times I am going to dare to think aloud. I feel that there is nothing to hide from Hawaii or her people; that we are all facing the same question, "Do you favor statehood for Hawaii?" There is no other answer but "Yes," if we are to vote as all Americans, loyal only to America.

First. The plebiscite question.

The plebiscite we are holding on election day will not settle the matter of statehood, but will influence Congress not only in regard to statehood, but in the national laws they will pass affecting us.

This may and may not be the most favorable time to have a statehood plebiscite with all the unsettled world conditions about us, but you must first realize how the plebiscite started.

It was first suggested by the joint committee of Congress that came here 3 years ago to investigate the question of statehood.

This committee decided that Hawaii was fully entitled to statehood and fully prepared for it, but they wanted to be sure that the people of Hawaii desired it, so they suggested that all doubts on that point be settled by a popular vote. Our legislature, out of deference to the great legislative body of our nation, followed the suggestion.

Any postponement of the plebiscite would have to be done by calling a special session of the legislature, or by an act of Congress, which would involve thousands of dollars. We of Hawaii have been thinking and talking statehood for years and not getting anywhere, why keep on talking, let us get some action and go on record as a people knowing their own mind.

The first objection seems to be overridden by the fact that the plebiscite is a popular vote, that by a secret ballot we have a chance to vote exactly as we please. The people of these islands, haoles, natives and aliens will be and make up the decision of Hawaii.

As a matter of fact, it was not a haole, but a Hawaiian, who, so far as history tells us, made the first important move toward statehood for the islands. That was nearly a century ago. That Hawaiian was King Kamehameha III, the ruler who first gave civil liberties to his people.

Kamehameha III had seen the independence of his kingdom threatened by powerful nations of Europe, by ruthless filibusters and adventurers and by the disaster of the Civil War. And so great became his dread that he voluntarily instructed his foreign minister to negotiate a treaty providing for annexation to the United States, "as" said the treaty, "a State, equal in all matters to the rest of the States."

If that treaty had ever been given effect, it would have cost Kamehameha III his throne and ended his dynasty. But he was willing to pay that price in order to make sure that Hawaii could exchange her sovereignty as a nation for sovereignty as a State in the great American republic—the strongest possible safeguard to the rights and liberties of the people.

That is precisely the case today. Statehood is the strongest possible security to Hawaii—the one absolute guarantee of our rights and liberties.

Today, just as in Kamehameha III's day, perils from the outside make us or should make us realize that the freedom and safety we enjoy as American citizens

are the most precious things in the world today and always. It must have been a sad moment when Kamehameha III made that decision. It was a sad moment to many a Hawaiian heart when, 50 years later, annexation did come, and Hawaii's kingdom passed away forever. To my fellow Hawaiians who knew and loved real Hawaii, whatever we had to lose, we lost at that moment. Offsetting it, we gained much. And whatever lies ahead in statehood for us must be further gains.

As a Territory we are denied the right to vote for president, the head of our Nation, and also for the Governor of Hawaii. We have no Senators and Representative in Congress. We have only a Territorial Delegate in Washington.

He cannot vote on any law passed by Congress, he cannot sit on any committee and help shape laws. All he can do is to persuade the Members of Congress to give Hawaii fair treatment. Hawaii has to obey all Federal laws and pay Federal taxes without a voice in their making. As a Territory, Congress can nullify any law passed by our legislature. It can change our form of government. It can take away many of the privileges that we now enjoy. It can discriminate against our industries. And although there isn't any likelihood that it ever would, it could even cede us to another nation.

Second objection to statehood: The haoles have taken enough away from the Hawaiian and Hawaii, and statehood will take away what little is left of Hawaii.

I address the Hawaiians as a Hawaiian, interested in their welfare and their problems.

No one is taking away anything from us Hawaiians or Hawaii, it is a case of giving it away to the haoles, Japanese, Chinese, and every other nationality but our own. I see it in the Hawaiian of mixed blood, and it cuts me deeply. There are a few of us left who are proud of anything Hawaiian and strive to instill in the Hawaiian the beauties of his land and heritage, but with his striving to become something that God did not intend him to be, he has failed and blames the haoles. No, my dear Hawaiians; love your Hawaii, love everything that means Hawaii and you will be an all American, the kind Hawaii needs, the kind America is looking for. It does not take money to show the world Hawaii in her true form, old or new, it takes the heart and you have all of that. Think of Hawaii first, and then you can not help but think American.

Chairman FARRINGTON. For the purpose of enabling you to clarify the reasons that cause you to change your mind, I think it might be appropriate to point out that in that statement you discussed the oriental question at considerable length, as one of the factors which entered into the consideration of this problem.

You said:

The third objection: The oriental question. Who is to blame for the oriental predominance in number and power in these islands. We of Hawaii. Let any foreign power enter Japan and try to establish themselves as the Japanese have in Hawaii, there would be a halt called on the first stand, but we in Hawaii let them go on and on sowing seeds on fertile soil that has yielded them a thousand-fold. We saw it all coming and did not make any pretense at stopping them, now at not too late an hour and perhaps at the most opportune time we fear their presence in Hawaii. It is not a time for fear, it is a time for justice and loyalty in which Congress, our legislature and every loyal American in Hawaii should play a part.

There are rats in every race who would sell their souls, not any more in the Japanese community than in other races and mixed races of Hawaii. If we can trust Japanese in positions nearest and most vital to our business and home life, then why fear their loyalty in a matter of government importance where our legislature and Congress are in full control?

The Japanese raise our fruits, vegetables, and flowers, they control our fish supply, they work in our homes, care for our children, hold places of responsibility in our fields of industries and factories, and with all that staring us in the face, we raise our voices in doubt against them. We need have no fear and doubt of the Japanese in Hawaii, it is what is outside of Hawaii, trying to get in.

The Japanese know a good thing when they have it and Hawaii should make them realize it more and more by enforcing laws for respect to a land of freedom, an American land.

I hope I have cleared away some of the objections to statehood. Show your American loyalty by voting "Yes," for statehood, and give to your children all the privileges of true American citizenship. Aloha.

I think you ought to have the opportunity to outline some of the reasons that caused you to take the position that you do today.

Senator CAMPBELL. Well, members of this honorable committee, I had just returned from being on the mainland for 20 years, so that I would be close to my children. I had not made a thorough examination of the conditions in Hawaii at the time. My son, who was in the advertising business, Walter MacFarlane, had the responsibility of putting over statehood, and he thought I might be able to influence some of the people of the Territory.

I did say every word of that, and I meant it at the time. But several years have passed, and I have made a thorough investigation of the conditions in our Hawaii. I have experienced things in Hawaii that I knew nothing of and never heard of at the time. The war has come about. It has brought other conditions. People have changed here in Hawaii. I am not trying to make the excuse or living on the words that a woman can change her mind. That is not the thing, our Delegate. It is simply that I found things different. Therefore I am taking it in the light of what I found, and what I saw existing in Hawaii today.

Chairman FARRINGTON. I think that is a fair enough answer on that.

Now, Senator Campbell, in the presentation of your figures on our population, have you used the total of the population, and the relative position of that portion of the changes of Japanese ancestry to the whole of the Japanese race?

Senator CAMPBELL. I don't quite understand the question.

Chairman FARRINGTON. In other words, can you tell the committee what proportion of the total population of this Territory was of the Japanese race in 1900, when these islands were given the territorial form of government?

Senator CAMPBELL. No. I didn't go back that far.

Chairman FARRINGTON. Well, I believe the figures are 40 percent at the time that Congress gave these islands a Territorial form of government. You have noted in your statistics that there has been an increase in the total Japanese population of the Territory, but have you related that to the total increase? In other words, what proportion were the Japanese to the total population in 1920?

Senator CAMPBELL. I think, perhaps you gentlemen could say.

Chairman FARRINGTON. At one time it was 42 percent. Your figures do not show the total decline in percentages in 1930 and in 1940, when it was 37 percent.

Have you presented also the figures showing the population in 1945?

Senator CAMPBELL. No. I have not been able to get that. But in 1940, the figures here show 400,000 total population.

Chairman FARRINGTON. Are those Census Bureau statistics?

Senator CAMPBELL. Yes, absolutely.

Chairman FARRINGTON. In other words, you have not used percentages, you have used—

Senator CAMPBELL. Actual figures.

Chairman FARRINGTON. You have used a total. You do not show the increase in the population, for instance, of the Caucasian group. I wonder if you were meaning to tell the committee that the record of the

people in the war is one of the factors which has led you to the conclusion that they are not ready for the responsibility of statehood?

Senator CAMPBELL. Do I understand that you mean that I do not feel that those who have taken actual part in the war, or what? I just don't quite understand your question.

Chairman FARRINGTON. I think it is important that you narrow down your criticism and indictment to those who, in your opinion, are the actual element of danger and uncertainty, and tell us if it is not true that you believe that all the men and women, regardless of racial extraction, who entered our service, were loyal, or offered their services to the country were loyal to it?

Senator CAMPBELL. Do we know?

Chairman FARRINGTON. In other words, you do not accept that as evidence of loyalty to the country?

Senator CAMPBELL. No.

Chairman FARRINGTON. It is valuable to have that clarified.

Now, I think the committee should know something of your distinguished background, Senator Campbell. You served two sessions in the Senate of the Territorial legislature?

Senator CAMPBELL. Yes.

Chairman FARRINGTON. In your statement you discuss reapportionment at considerable length, and state that no governor in the Territory had asked the legislature to reapportion itself.

Senator CAMPBELL. A bill came down, and was presented, and the senators of the outside districts came to ask me, as a new senator. I didn't know enough about politics that I could discuss it with them. I relied absolutely on their integrity to tell me if there was anything that was not absolutely fair to our understanding of the Congress of the United States. I did not question any part of what they asked me. They simply said, "We want you to vote with us; that the control of Hawaii and our legislature is not all upon the one island, Oahu, and by the outside islands sticking together, we will still hold control." Of course, being a senator of an outside island, I had to be loyal, I would insist on being loyal to the outside islands.

Chairman FARRINGTON. In other words, you opposed reapportionment?

Senator CAMPBELL. I did.

Chairman FARRINGTON. I was wondering if you had read the various messages that have been sent to the legislature by governors over a period of 20 years, to know whether or not they have recommended that provision of the Organic Act be carried out?

Senator CAMPBELL. I have heard that they have. I haven't read it. I merely heard it. I say that if the governor—any governor, not the present governor in particular, but any governor of Hawaii—if his responsibility was to see that Hawaii did the right thing, then he should have taken it to Congress, if we didn't do the right thing.

Chairman FARRINGTON. I wanted to establish in the record, the fact that reapportionment had been recommended by at least three governors, to my knowledge. Isn't it true also that on that question, with rare exception, the division has been on sectional lines, that representation from the outside islands, of which you were a member, has consistently opposed the enactment of necessary laws for that purpose?

Senator CAMPBELL. Very true, Mr. Delegate, but is that any reason why you, even, and the Governor in office, Mr. Delegate, should permit us to do the wrong thing?

Chairman FARRINGTON. I quite agree with you, but I would like to ask you if you presented any legislation for that purpose.

Senator CAMPBELL. No.

Chairman FARRINGTON. And if it is your opinion that in view of your position on reapportionment that you carried out your responsibility as a public official by not presenting that legislation?

Senator CAMPBELL. As soon as I found out, which was about 3 days after I had approved of the fact that we should stick together from the outside islands, I heard of this Organic Act, and I immediately looked it up, but it was too late. I had already approved something that I had left entirely to the integrity of my senators from the outside islands.

Chairman FARRINGTON. To conclude the inquiry about reapportionment, may I ask in the event that the governor calls a special session of the Legislature, you will support reapportionment for the Territory?

Senator CAMPBELL. Absolutely.

Chairman FARRINGTON. I think with that extra vote, it would probably be passed.

Senator CAMPBELL. But, let me add; I think it would be a great waste of Territorial funds to have a special session. I want that to go in the record.

Chairman FARRINGTON. Mr. Larcade, would you like to ask any questions?

Representative LARCADE. I have no questions.

Representative TAYLOR. I would like to join with you, Mr. Farrington, in complimenting your senator on her very able presentation. It will be a very valuable part of our record. However, Senator Campbell, there is something that you have stated that I just don't understand. You have complained that the Japanese have enhanced their social and economic position in the Territory, is that right?

Senator CAMPBELL. I didn't specially mention them. I specially mentioned Filipinos.

Representative TAYLOR. Did you intend to include with the Filipinos the Japanese?

Senator CAMPBELL. Not necessarily.

Representative TAYLOR. Well, you presented some figures which indicated that the Japanese population had increased, and that the bank accounts had increased correspondingly. Do you object to that?

Senator CAMPBELL. No. I never object to any money coming into our Territory, no matter from what source, providing it is a legitimate source, I would say.

Representative TAYLOR. Then, I take it, if the Japanese people in the Territory do continue to enhance their position socially and economically, that you have no complaint to make about that?

Senator CAMPBELL. Not if they act and behave like American citizens.

Representative TAYLOR. Well, you have not cited any instances that would indicate that any people of the Territory have acted in anything but an American way.

Senator CAMPBELL. We have a few who do not know what American democracy is. That is a condition in all the races of this community. That is why I feel that just as soon as humanly possible, that the words of American democracy be taught and be defined to every individual in the Territory. There is a confused idea of democracy. But some one who really knows the true meaning of American democracy, I think should tour the islands, and educate every one of us here in Hawaii.

Representative TAYLOR. Don't you think that if Hawaii should become the forty-ninth State that the very thing that you are now talking about would be inculcated into the minds of the people of the Territory? That they would know democracy, as we presumably know it on the mainland?

Senator CAMPBELL. Why couldn't you teach it to us as a Territory? Then, if the time ever comes that we become the forty-ninth State, we will go in knowing what democracy is, and the real American democracy.

Chairman FARRINGTON. Mr. Angell.

Representative ANGELL. I want to join with the others in commending you on your forthright statement, and the very excellent presentation of your position.

I just have one or two questions.

Is it your feeling that under statehood you would not have as strong a position in correcting the evils of which you complain as you have under the Territorial form of government?

Senator CAMPBELL. I feel that with the present form of government, which is the Territorial status, that we should adjust our own problems, and come before the Congress of the United States clean, and I think we should do it as a Territory.

Representative ANGELL. Of course, you have had some 45 years to correct those evils; if they still exist in an impressive way, then it would seem that the Territorial form of government is not equal to the problem.

Senator CAMPBELL. I would answer that in this way: Who is it that has put us in the position we are today but the people who are asking you for statehood? We, the real people of Hawaii, are perfectly happy, just as we are. [Applause.]

Chairman FARRINGTON. I will ask the people in the audience to refrain from demonstrations until after the conclusion of the interrogation.

Representative ANGELL. Of course, we, as a committee, and the Congress, I presume, must not overlook the fact that you have had a plebiscite. When a committee previously from Congress was here studying the question of statehood, one of the conclusions was that the people themselves ought to vote on the question of statehood before Congress acted affirmatively on it. Following that you did have a plebiscite, and the information that has come to the committee is that according to that plebiscite more than two to one voted for statehood. Wouldn't the committee and Congress assume that the people of Hawaii, or a large proportion of them, were favorable to statehood?

Senator CAMPBELL. I think Congress is probably not aware of the fact that conditions in Hawaii have changed very rapidly since that plebiscite was taken.

Representative ANGELL. The information that we have received is to the effect that if a vote was taken today, it would be much heavier for statehood than it was when it was taken several years ago.

Senator CAMPBELL. Are you and Congress going to take that? Don't you think that we should have another plebiscite?

Representative ANGELL. Well, you have had 45 years to decide that question. Of course, there must be an ending some time.

Senator CAMPBELL. But I think in fairness to those who dare not express themselves, because of conditions, and to those who really do not want statehood, another plebiscite should be taken. If it is two to one, or 100 to 1, I have nothing more to say, but I would still be against it.

Representative ANGELL. On the question of reapportionment, I mentioned in an earlier session of the committee, that that is a problem which exists in a good many States of the Union. I assume that in New York, by reason of the heavy population in the City of New York, it exists. It certainly exists in my State, by reason of the fact that there is concentrated in my district more than a third of the population of the State. The people of my district, I believe, are entitled to much greater representation in the State legislature than they now enjoy. The constitution provides that we shall have apportionment in accordance with the population, but we do not have it. We do not have it for the very same reasons that you do not have it here, because the vote is so heavy outside my district that their strength cannot be overcome.

That is true here, but that is no argument, in my judgment, why the State of Oregon should be denied statehood or should be taken out of the Union. I think that is a problem that could be handled just as effectively under the form of government that exists in the State as it does in the Territorial form of government. I may be wrong on that, however.

Senator CAMPBELL. Well, then, if the members of Congress know that such conditions exist, not only in Hawaii, as to reapportionment, but in your various States, I feel that you should make a correction.

Representative ANGELL. That is true.

Senator CAMPBELL. And let it be a good example for Hawaii.

Representative ANGELL. But you just come to Congress and try to make a correction.

Senator CAMPBELL. I have no desire to go. I feel that there are enough capable men in Congress today. They do not need me.

Representative ANGELL. Well, the point of my statement is this: That it is a very difficult problem with 435 men in the House, and 96 men in the Senate, to arrive at exact justice in legislation. It is a matter of give and take, of compromise. Where large groups of people are involved, it is almost impossible to arrive at exact justice. We have to strike some middle ground by way of compromise.

Senator CAMPBELL. Is there any way of making amendments to the Constitution?

Representative ANGELL. Yes. We have made a great many, and will, perhaps, make more, but it is a slow process. It requires a long

time to amend the Constitution. The framers of the Constitution designed it so it should be that way.

Representative DELANEY. May I join with my colleagues in acknowledging the undoubted sincerity of your convictions.

Senator CAMPBELL. Thank you, sir.

Representative DELANEY. And to compliment you upon the very forceful presentation that you have made here in opposition to the admission of Hawaii to statehood.

You were asked whether or not on a previous occasion you supported the admission of Hawaii to statehood, and I presume you were here for a great part of the hearings, is that right?

Senator CAMPBELL. I was here for every hearing except Tuesday. I just came in the evening.

Representative DELANEY. Well, it is a fact, is it not, that many of those who appeared here in behalf of the admission of Hawaii to statehood, at one time opposed its admission?

Senator CAMPBELL. That I don't know.

Representative DELANEY. Well, now, have you any information as to whether or not there was an organized drive to get votes in the recent plebiscite in favor of statehood?

Senator CAMPBELL. There have been several drives in private organizations, as well as public.

Representative DELANEY. Do you know of any organized drive in opposition to statehood?

Senator CAMPBELL. No. There has never been any group, or any one who felt that they wanted to go out and boldly advocate anti-statehood.

Representative DELANEY. Now, of course, you have no reason whatsoever, financially or otherwise, to change your opinion; it is just that you are convinced that Hawaii should not be admitted to statehood, is that right?

Senator CAMPBELL. I feel that since the war we have become so important in our location between the mainland and our new possessions, that we could act better in the way of protection, and in the way of administration, by being a separate entity, away from the mainland. We are here, and although we take orders, I feel that we should happily do that, from Congress. At the same time, I think if Hawaii had an independent form of government, a government whereby the Congress of the United States would have a slight hold on us, so that we could not go absolutely haywire, but that we keep our independent form of government, and it is up to Congress to see that we have that.

We are too far away to be intimately connected with you. It is going to be a tremendous expense for us to send our senators back to you, and bring them back here. We have found that in the expense of a Delegate, but he has so ably represented us that I have no resentment, and have no feeling that we have wasted money.

I have known and been associated with Mr. Farrington a great many years, and before that with his father, and I will say, not because Mr. Farrington is here, but because Mr. Farrington and his family background have shown that he is 100 percent for Hawaii. I therefore feel that we do not need anyone outside of Mr. Farrington who so sincerely represents us.

Representative DELANEY. Just as a point of information, Senator Campbell, the Federal Government would, of course, pay the salary of Senators and Representatives who would be sent to Congress; also the cost of transporting them to Washington, and back to Hawaii, so that in that way there would be no additional expense to this particular area.

Senator CAMPBELL. I know, but on the other hand we were asked—I think it was in the 1945 session, although I am not positive about that—for an extra amount, an extra appropriation to be made so that our Delegate could come back here to attend to a few little minor details. It was going to cost us \$10,000, but the legislature didn't see fit. So that no matter how much was expended by Congress to take our senators and representatives back and forth, we would still have some emergency come up which we would not expect Congress to pay, because that would be an almost personal matter of the Territory, and we would be willing to take out of our own budget the money to be expended to enable him to put over a certain little point that might be too personal for Congress to bother about.

Representative DELANEY. Now, do you know of your own knowledge whether or not the Hawaiian sugar interests are behind this movement for statehood?

Senator CAMPBELL. They are definitely behind this move for statehood, and I say that, because I, being a beneficiary of one of the largest estates here, and we do business with the Big Five, I have had occasion to hear it day in and day out, their sentiments on statehood, and against it, too.

Representative DELANEY. Is there in existence such a group as the Big Five?

Senator CAMPBELL. Absolutely, there has been for years, and still is.

Representative DELANEY. Is it your opinion, from the position that you hold, and the opportunity to negotiate with them, that they control a great portion of the business of this island?

Senator CAMPBELL. Absolutely.

Representative DELANEY. I was interested to know whether you attended the session when Mr. Shivers, who was a former FBI agent, and who was in charge of this area up until 1943, testified. Were you here the day that he testified?

Senator CAMPBELL. I was not here, but I know Mr. Shivers personally. So did my son. He was a great friend of Mr. Shivers. I have a great admiration, also, for Mr. Shivers, but from the accounts that I have heard of his testimony, I am rather surprised.

Representative DELANEY. Well, is it not true that Mr. Shivers was here in charge of the FBI and as an agent of the Federal Government, to protect not only Hawaii, but the States of the Union, when the Pearl Harbor attack occurred, until 1943?

Senator CAMPBELL. He was here.

Representative DELANEY. And is it not true that it was his duty to investigate and make an impartial report to the Federal government?

Senator CAMPBELL. I know he did his duty. But as to his report, I could not say that it expressed all that he did in the line of his duty.

Representative DELANEY. Well, then, you are familiar with the testimony given here on a different occasion by Mr. Shivers, is that right?

Senator CAMPBELL. Well, you mean in the last years?

Representative DELANEY. During this past week.

Senator CAMPBELL. Yes; it was just said in an off-hand way, the substance.

Representative DELANEY. If I were to tell you that Mr. Shivers testified here and said that he investigated every instance that was called to his attention, and there were numerous incidents of alleged espionage and sabotage, but that in no instance did he find any evidence that such was the case, would that change your opinion?

Senator CAMPBELL. No.

Representative DELANEY. You are still convinced that there were some people here who were not wholeheartedly with the United States during the recent war?

Senator CAMPBELL. Absolutely.

Representative DELANEY. Well, now, let us go to the figures that you enumerated on this chart. First, let me ask you this question: Isn't it true that the Japanese were just as lax as the other people in exercising their privilege to vote?

Senator CAMPBELL. Well, that I could not answer, because I think that it is the privilege of any one of us not to feel like voting on the day of the election.

Representative DELANEY. Well, I don't dispute that, but when we take these figures, isn't it true that the Japanese failed to exercise their right of franchise in a fair proportion to what other people did?

Senator CAMPBELL. Absolutely.

Representative DELANEY. And that they were just as lax as many people of other races?

Senator CAMPBELL. Yes.

Representative DELANEY. When you compiled your figures to show that the Japanese could control, you took into consideration the fact that all of the Japanese votes, if they were cast, could outweigh the votes of the other people, if they voted as they did in the last election; is that right?

Senator CAMPBELL. I would say on any issue that would be against their interest they could swing the decision; they are powerful enough in this community to swing the decision with the split votes of other groups.

Representative DELANEY. Well, now, when you speak of deposits, I assume that you mean bank deposits. Is that right?

Senator CAMPBELL. Yes.

Representative DELANEY. Isn't it true that a great portion of the wealth of this Territory is in real property?

Senator CAMPBELL. No; I would not say that.

Representative DELANEY. Do I understand you to tell us, Senator, that a great portion of the wealth of these islands is not in real property? By real property I mean the land and the improvements?

Senator CAMPBELL. No.

Representative DELANEY. Well, what is the total amount of deposits that you have of everyone in this Territory during the year 1940?

Senator CAMPBELL. My chart does not go up to 1940. It just goes as far as 1934.

Representative DELANEY. Well, Senator, could you give us the total amount of the deposits in 1934?

Senator CAMPBELL. The total deposits were \$162,393.

Representative DELANEY. And the total value of real estate in 1934?

Senator CAMPBELL. That I haven't here. I would be very happy to produce any data that the committee would like to have. I would be happy to look it up, if I haven't got it with me.

Representative DELANEY. On reflection, thinking over the total deposits of \$162,393—

Senator CAMPBELL. I beg your pardon; that was the number of accounts.

Representative DELANEY. Well, can you give me the total value of deposits?

Senator CAMPBELL. \$35,082,104.56.

Representative DELANEY. Well, isn't it true that the possession of land and the improvements on the land would reach in excess of \$35,000,000?

Senator CAMPBELL. I should judge so.

Representative DELANEY. Senator, isn't it very apparent that the real estate, the buildings and improvements on all of these islands, is far in excess of \$35,000,000?

Senator CAMPBELL. Yes.

Representative DELANEY. So that your analysis as to the proportion of the money held by the Japanese does not include property and improvements on the property?

Senator CAMPBELL. I would say that a great many of the Japanese places of business and their homes are on leased property, therefore it is very difficult to tell how much they are an actual contribution to Hawaii, it is difficult to tell how we could actually get those figures. It is not like the big estates, where we know that they control a certain area. Their place of business is there. Their business figures are there. When it comes to the Japanese, the Chinese, or some of the other races, it is very difficult to get the exact status because of their leasing property, there are so many leases, rather than actual ownership.

Representative DELANEY. Well, isn't it true that large corporations, big business, does not allow an unusually large amount of money to remain on deposit in the bank?

Senator CAMPBELL. That I wouldn't know.

Representative DELANEY. Well, isn't it true that the people who deposit their money in savings banks are, as a rule, people who are in the low income brackets?

Senator CAMPBELL. I imagine that you could check that in the savings account, but I didn't go into that phase in my data.

Representative DELANEY. The only thought that I have in mind is that the deposits in the bank do not reflect the real wealth of the community.

Senator CAMPBELL. No, definitely not.

Representative DELANEY. Thank you.

Chairman FARRINGTON. Mr. Miller?

Representative MILLER. First I want to joint with my colleagues in congratulating Senator Campbell upon her fine presentation.

I would like to know this, Senator, to set it right in my mind: Do you think there is a suppression of any group's opinion, either for fear of punishment, or otherwise, or fear of steps that may be taken, preventing them from coming out and expressing themselves against statehood?

Senator CAMPBELL. Absolutely, because my telephone has been going, and I am asked, "Kamokila, I wish you would present this." I would say, "Why don't you go and present it? The committee have given you the privilege of speaking." "We can't, Kamokila. My husband would lose his job. They would take it away from him, Kamokila, you know." If I had to present all the facts, gentlemen, you would have to be absent from Congress.

Representative MILLER. For the sake of the record, I might say that several people, at least two of whom I know to be substantial people, having known them on the mainland, have protested off the record to me, and I asked them to come here publicly to make their statements, and they said it would adversely affect them or compromise them.

But Senator, I am not entirely satisfied with the position of certain dominant factors on the island, referred to briefly as the Big Five, who have made presentations here in favor of statehood; then later, some one representing the labor viewpoint came here and made a substantial presentation for statehood also. How do you account for those two divergent issues, the lion and the lamb, so to speak, lying side by side?

Senator CAMPBELL. How could labor do otherwise when they are dependent on the capital of the Big Five?

Representative MILLER. I know on the mainland labor has not allowed itself to become subservient to other interests, but has stood out forthright. If it were not for the fact that labor has taken that stand, some very progressive legislation might not have passed. If it were not for the aggressive action of the people, in which labor played a part, California would be under the domination of the Southern Pacific Railroad, but we threw off the yoke. We still have a few more yokes to throw off over there.

It was my impression, and I would like to have you discuss this, if you will: Recognizing that certain of these evils do exist, wouldn't Hawaii, placed on her own as a State, be in a position to correct those conditions, and to accept the responsibilities that go with that, as other States in the Union had to accept them? New York once upon a time was dominated by certain interests that controlled the politics of the State, but I think they have shaken off those shackles so that New York is now very free in its expression. We have had that throughout the country. Don't you think that Hawaii, and the people here, are intelligent enough to rise to that occasion, if given an opportunity?

Senator CAMPBELL. A great many may be intelligent, but they are not sincere. As far as New York is concerned, maybe they owe a great deal to Mr. Delaney. I don't know how he performs in Congress, but from the way that he has performed here, he has been absolutely just and sincere to Hawaii.

I do not mean by that to single you out, Mr. Delaney, any more than the rest of the committee. You have all been very fair in your hearings. I want to thank you on behalf of the people of Hawaii.

Chairman FARRINGTON. Does that complete your statement?

Senator CAMPBELL. I think so, unless the chairman of the committee, and you, Mr. Delegate, or the rest of the members want any other information. If you should, I want you to feel that you are free to call upon me at any time. If there is anything I can do for you men, as well as for Hawaii, just call on me. If it means I have to go to Washington to deliver the goods, I will go. It won't cost the Government or Congress anything.

Chairman FARRINGTON. Thank you very much, Senator.

Senator CAMPBELL. This I want to give to you, Joe. It is from the very top of the hills. I want it to go to you with a lot of aloha from all of us who love you, Joe. We want you to do the right thing by us.

(Senator Campbell presents to Delegate Farrington a maile lei in traditional fashion.) [Applause.]

(Senator Campbell was excused and withdrew.)

Chairman FARRINGTON. Thank you very sincerely, Kamokila.

Representative ANGELL. I would like the opportunity to make a brief statement with reference to my own State, and to an editorial which appeared in a local Oregon paper, if I may. It will take but a few moments.

The State of Oregon is very much of a good neighbor to Hawaii. Down through the years we have been in close contact with your people here, particularly in the early history of the west coast, and this island group.

There appeared in the Oregon Daily Journal, one of the two leading papers of my State, a short editorial which I would like to read. It is headed, "State of Hawaii," and says:

Oregon has an abiding interest in the Territory of Hawaii's ambition for statehood. The inclusion of Representative Homer D. Angell as a member of the House territorial subcommittee enroute to open hearings on the Territory's plea, is a happy augury that Oregon will have a sympathetic voice in the final deliberations and report of the fact finding group, whatever its recommendations may be.

There has been a community of interest, and of trade, between Hawaii and this area from the beginning of the exploration and settlement of the Oregon country. In 1811 the first farm animals came to Old Oregon from Hawaii, then the Sandwich Islands, in the ship *Tonquin*. They were brought by the John Jacob Astor fur trading party, and were landed near the site of the present city of Astoria. From his sawmill at Ford Vancouver, built in 1825, Dr. John McLaughlin, Hudson's Bay factor, shipped lumber to Hawaii. A decade later, Nathaniel Wyeth, who hoped to establish a business rivaling that of Dr. McLoughlin's company, brought cattle, goats, and hogs from Hawaii, and placed them on Wapato (Sauvies) Island on the Columbia River. In the forties, missionaries and their families and their adventuresome friends sailed here from the Atlantic seaboard by way of Hawaii. Owyhee, Oregon place name, is believed by some researchers to have been an early English spelling of the word.

Over 100 years ago Thomas Hart Benton, United States Senator from Missouri, prophesied the day when—

commerce from the Orient and the islands of the Pacific will pour into the valley of the Mississippi through the channels of Oregon.

No less farseeing was his colleague, Senator Lewis Fields Linn, who, in 1838, introducing a bill to establish the Territory of Oregon and to grant land to actual settlers, argued that the—

occupation of Oregon would secure sources of vast wealth in the fur trade, in the fisheries, in Hawaii, and the Orient.

Historical circumstances may be a matter of interest rather than of importance. Of timely and practicable record are the facts of Portland's development of trade with Hawaii in the years immediately preceding World War II, local docks having handled in 1940 approximately one and a half million dollars worth of export goods alone to the islands.

Now, of prime significance are the potentialities of future expansion of that commerce, particularly should the Territory be raised to the status of sovereign statehood.

Aloha to Hawaii and its aspirations for statehood.

Thank you.

Chairman FARRINGTON. Members of the committee, I know that you are very anxious to conclude our proceedings, because you have an engagement this noon, and one later this afternoon, and because you must go to Kauai tomorrow, and then proceed to Washington on Saturday.

However, there are a few witnesses who have signified a desire to be heard, and I think it might be well to continue the proceedings for another 15 or 20 minutes, if it is agreeable to the committee, for the purpose of concluding the hearing.

Beyond these, if there are others, may I say that the committee will be very happy to receive any statements or letters that any one cares to present to the committee.

I believe I can say very truthfully that everyone has been given a very complete opportunity to be heard. Insofar as at the meeting on Tuesday night, an open invitation was extended to anyone to appear and testify, and several responded, I think we have covered the requirements from that standpoint.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield the chair back to you, for the purpose of first making a brief statement myself concerning some of the testimony that has just been given.

(Delegate Farrington yields the chair to Chairman Larcade.)

Chairman LARCADE. You may proceed.

Delegate FARRINGTON. I want to clarify my position in a very few words on some of the points raised in the testimony of Senator Campbell.

I wish to say at the outset that Senator Campbell and myself have been very dear friends for many years, as was her son, Walter MacFarlane and myself, and I expect we will continue to be for many years to come, so that any difference we have have on public issues is anything but personal.

I respect your point of view now, Senator Campbell, and always will. And I think you know, and most of the people of Hawaii know that my advocacy of statehood over a long period of years, does not spring from any personal considerations, from any request or pressure from any particular source or group, but from a very deep

conviction that it is the destiny of the people of these islands, and that it is in the interests of the people of the United States.

At the very outset of the organization of our government on the Territorial basis, questions were raised as to the capacity of our people to govern themselves. If I recall the statistics correctly, the proportion of our population that was of the Japanese race at that time was as high as 40 percent. The predominating group was native Hawaiian.

Congress knew that when it gave us the Territorial form of government. At the time there was grave doubt as to whether the native people could be trusted with the full responsibility of citizenship. It was proposed that the property qualifications be set down for voting. That proposal, as I understand, was opposed and defeated by Senator Morgan, of Alabama, and our native Hawaiian people were given the right to vote without any property qualification whatsoever.

In the years that followed, we have had people repeatedly cast doubts as to the loyalty of our people, and their capacity to manage their own affairs. As each racial group has come into maturity as American citizens, its members have found their place in our public life, and in other phases of our life. One by one these people have been accepted by the rest of the people as American citizens.

The position of the Japanese is one that has been studied very closely over a period of more than 40 years. In 1920 their numerical position reached that of 42 percent of our total population. That was when the first generation was at its peak. The Office of Education of the United States sent a committee down here to investigate that situation. They made some dire predictions as to what was going to happen to this Territory by reason of the increase in the numerical superiority of the Japanese race. They made recommendations concerning the alien-language press, and the alien-language school, which we tried to carry out.

The experience of the next 10 years, however, proved that these predictions were untrue. They proved that the people of the Japanese race, like those of other races, were adapting their life to the same pattern of American life that we all followed.

The numerical position of the Japanese people began to decline. It went down to 37 percent in 1940, and in 1945 it went down to less than 33 $\frac{1}{3}$ percent. That was the result of two developments. One was a decline in the birth rate, which dropped more than 50 percent, and fell to a position lower than that of the people of part-Hawaiian blood. The other factor was the immigration of people from the other parts of the country, as is shown very strongly in the fact that the statistics of our population show in 1945, on June 30, the largest ethnic group in the Territory was of Caucasian extraction.

I have always felt, and still feel, that the determining factor in our life is not racial ancestry, and I believe that nothing proves that more definitely than the record of the war.

I cannot agree with the point of view of Senator Campbell on the record of our people during the war. I cannot agree particularly with that of the Americans of Japanese ancestry.

On the question of the extensive publicity that was given that group, that arose from two factors. The first was that they were segregated against their will. The second was that the War Department, by

way of justifying that policy, and the policy of giving them an opportunity to serve their country, gave a great deal of emphasis to their performance. Frankly, there were many people skeptical as to the result.

While there may be people in our Territory who are of doubtful allegiance, I do not think they are confined to any one racial group. I think everyone who has carefully studied the problem, realizes that, if anything, the record of the war vindicates the philosophy that has ruled us all these years, that the people of any race who were born here and given the opportunity of American education, will make good Americans.

Now, I want to cover one more point. A great deal of emphasis was given to the influence of the so-called Big Five. I wish to point out that labor has come into this proceeding with the most enthusiastic endorsement of statehood, and I think their point of view is shared by a great many people who feel that there are serious economical problems in this territory to solve, and the solution can best be found by our own people.

I think it is well to point out that we have been a Territory 45 years, and during that period the Federal Government has controlled the executive and judicial branch of the government, where all the authority of law enforcement is vested, and has controlled the right to veto any of the acts of our legislature. I feel, therefore, that the answer to that point is that it is not to say certain conditions don't exist, but that the best solution will be found by our own people, rather than by people abroad.

I want to conclude now, Mr. Chairman, and say that our former Delegate to Congress, Mr. Victor Houston, desires to make a statement at this time, and at the conclusion of this statement, Mr. McEldowney will make a statement. I believe, with these two witnesses, we can conclude the hearing.

Chairman LARCADE. The committee will be glad to hear from Mr. Houston, former Delegate from the Territory of Hawaii.

Mr. VICTOR S. K. HOUSTON (former Delegate to Congress from Hawaii). Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, do you wish my background for the record?

Chairman LARCADE. I think that it is well known to the committee, and it will not be necessary at this time. You may proceed.

Mr. HOUSTON. Gentlemen, I would not appear before you were it not for the statements that have been made by the preceding witness, and I appear specifically for the purpose of rebutting some of the evidence which she submitted.

A glance at the chart [reference is to exhibit No. 75] which hangs back of you shows very clearly how the statistics have been manipulated for the purpose of trying to prove their side of the case.

I have before me the population data for the period from 1925 to and including 1945, which are readily had, and which I obtained no later than this morning by going and applying for them at the bureau of vital statistics.

It is interesting, if you will glance at the chart, to notice that the Japanese population figure appears to be the highest rate upon the chart, and that below that you find rates for various other groups,

including that of the American. Nowhere does there appear a graph of the Caucasian population.

It is interesting to note that from the latest available data in 1945, for the first time the Caucasian population exceeded that of the total Japanese population; 172,503 Caucasian as against 163,000 Japanese. That is indicative of the trend.

An analysis of the columns of this table will indicate that the Caucasian group has mounted at an increasing and accelerating rate as against that of the Japanese, and last year negatived the increase for the first time.

Every year between 1925 and 1945 the increase of the Japanese has only been 15 to 2,800, whereas there are years in the Caucasian column where there is an increase shown of 10,000 per year, and that does not include the war workers recently arrived.

Speaking merely as an individual—I do not belong to that fortunate group which is represented by the previous speaker—I feel, of course, that she can be very happy to remain under the conditions that now exist here. We, on the other hand, look forward to improved conditions that would follow by reason of accepting a pattern, if it will be granted us, that has been followed in every other community in the country since the formation of this Republic.

The question of the Japanese is apparently the principal question, and I have shown here that the rate of increase amongst the Caucasians, which is now the predominating group in the Territory, has overcome that, and is now the largest single group by some 9,000 persons. That is an impressive factor.

Then, when you consider the increase of population, you find that whereas the Japanese constitute only less than a third of the population—32.5 actually, for this last year, 1945, for which statistics are available—the increase of population from births also amounts to about a third.

How in the world could they become a predominating group when you consider that in addition to the natural course by births here, we have in-migration from the mainland, whereas in-migration from the Asiatic continent is absolutely forbidden now, under the law. So the only increase that the Japanese can get is by way of natural birth rate.

Now, very many of those boys and girls, whom I admire very much for the persistence that they have shown in trying to better themselves, have proved their worth. The fact that they have increased their bank holdings is indicative of the character of these people. When they attain professional status they will not always remain here, but since migration to the mainland is open to them, many of them will go there in order further to better themselves, and develop their opportunities. All of this will tend to reduce further the ratio of percentage of the population that they constitute.

Much has been said about the language schools, which have now been abolished, but no one has ever said that there were features about those language schools which were of real benefit to the Territory. We have not yet got universal kindergartens. Since the Japanese population, very largely and predominantly was a working population, there had to be some way in which the families could take care of their younger children. Those language schools did, in fact, provide such care. It is quite apparent, also, that in those schools they learned family be-

havior, and also a measure of morality and courtesy, a quality which many of the Japanese have, and I can recall the ones here, have to a marked degree.

We need not fear a Japanese becoming a governor here. That presupposes a split among all the others, and a solidarity among the Japanese group. What the Hawaiians were afraid of here at one time was the threat of a malihini governor being imposed upon us by amendments to the organic act, which can be done, of course, under the set-up, wherein we are merely a possession of the United States. Were it possible that such a governor were always a top-class man, perhaps we need not fear so much, but we have read the history of carpet-bagging, and we do not want to have imposed upon us a governor who would come down here without any knowledge of conditions or the particular circumstances of this varied population.

We would prefer, even, were that one of the probabilities, which I say it is not, that some locally born Japanese might, in an extreme instance, be our Governor. Were such a one selected, you can take it for granted he would probably be selected because he was an outstanding man.

You have heard some of our young boys here take care of themselves in speaking to you on this matter of statehood, and I would venture to suggest that some of them made a rather good showing.

I used to say to LaGuardia when he and I were in the House together—I as a Delegate:

If the President of the United States should appoint you as Governor of Hawaii, I might be satisfied, but, of course, we would prefer to have a governor of our own. He would not have to wield the big stick.

Commission government was one of the things that the opponents of statehood threatened us with. A time of war, such as we have gone through, is indicative of what a commission form of government might be. We practically had military government here. No one has brought up the question of whether it was necessary to continue the suspension of the writ of habeas corpus for the length of time that it was denied to us. The Governor of the Territory, of course, can only suspend the writ of habeas corpus until he has heard from the President. Therefore, the suspension of the writ of habeas corpus is by authority of the President of the United States, and that is actually what happened here. It continued for a length of time which even our courts thought was unnecessary.

Be that as it may, I am not in a position to criticize either side at this time.

With respect to the threat of Japanese sabotage or disloyalty here, I was in a position through this last war as district security officer in the Fourteenth Naval District, to be familiar with these conditions to a certain degree. While we necessarily took all precautions to prevent any untoward incident happening, at no time during the 4 years that I served here, did there come to my attention any effort to sabotage the naval installations. And there were, as you probably realize necessarily, persons of the Japanese race living in close proximity to installations that were considered to be of extreme sensitiveness to sabotage. I will only mention the drum gasoline storage, at one time containing a million drums of high octane aviation gasoline.

There was nothing between those stacks of drum gasoline and the highways and the boundary of the reservation but stacks of water-filled drums. But within the almost immediate neighborhood, I might say, there were persons of Japanese ancestry living. If ever there was temptation to commit sabotage, there was the opportunity to do it effectively, because it was the storage for all of the naval aviation at the front. If one stack had gone, the whole of the stacks would have gone. But never, during that time were we able, exercising the greatest care in following up leads, to find anything that approximated sabotage.

Of course, we were on our guard. Perhaps that prevented sabotage. I couldn't say to the contrary.

I am for statehood, as I said on Molokai. I am for statehood now. I have consistently advocated it.

The question of reapportionment, of course, will be taken care of when a constitution is to be formed, because Congress would not accept a constitution that we might present to them unless proper proportionate representation was provided for. So that is the entire argument for or against statehood. Those are things that will come, perhaps better under statehood than under the Territorial form of government.

Finally, perhaps I might invite attention to the fact that most of the opposition to this movement has come from nonresidents; from recent arrivals; from mainlanders who have come down here and gone into business; or perhaps from those more fortunate people who were large landed proprietors.

The other opponent that I might mention didn't have the benefit of American schooling. I think that if there was a situation which justified the insistence of old Governor Farrington on the development of public education, it is that as a result of that public education the boys and girls have developed along the American pattern. They didn't want to go, most of these boys and girls, to the language schools, but they were more or less forced by their parents to go there.

As to the parents, many of those old people of the Japanese race who came here at the demand of the major industry, and have given their lives to the production of something which was needed by our country, would willingly have become American citizens, did the law so allow. But they may not become American citizens because of the restriction with respect to Asiatics.

So there they are, divided in their allegiance. They want to support their children. Many of them have encouraged their children to do their duty to the country under whose flag they have been born, and from whose administration and government they have derived all the opportunities that have come to them in their lives. There they are. They want to do what is right.

None of the Hawaiian A. J. A.'s who were in the armed forces have advertised themselves. As you saw the other night, the chaplain came up and came to speak to you, and you, Mr. Miller, invited attention to the fact that he wore the Purple Heart, and the Presidential Citation. He did not mention it. He probably would be the last man to mention such a thing.

I will ask you to encourage us in our aspirations for that which is the most basic American doctrine, the policy of complete self-government under the flag, as a State of the Union.

Chairman LARCADE. Thank you very much.

(Mr. Houston at this time was excused and withdrew.)

(After the close of this hearing the following letter was received, to be inserted in the record at this point.)

HONOLULU 37, T. H., January 18, 1946.

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE,

Chairman, Subcommittee on the Territories, meeting in Honolulu.

MY DEAR MR. LARCADE: I find upon looking over the report of my testimony given before your committee yesterday, that probably because of the extemporaneous character of my remarks, and more probably because of the hurry due to the time element, that I may have left a wrong impression upon some of the members of the committee in what I said with respect to the language schools.

I did not mean to convey the impression that the language schools, as such, had been beneficial to the Territory. I have always in the past argued for their elimination. What I meant to convey was that there were certain beneficial phases in them that had not been mentioned, and which I felt deserved consideration.

After the hearing Congressman Miller mentioned this matter to me, and I regret that because of the lateness of the noonday hearing he did not question me upon the matter at the time.

May I request that this letter be appended to my remarks, and made a part of the record.

Very respectfully,

V. S. K. HOUSTON.

Chairman LARCADE. You have one more witness?

Delegate FARRINGTON. Mr. McEldowney.

Chairman LARCADE. Mr. McEldowney. Do you have a lengthy statement, sir? The time has passed so rapidly, we have gone past our time of adjournment.

Mr. JAMES MCELDOWNEY. It will be about 5 minutes.

Chairman LARCADE. We will be glad to give you 5 minutes. You may proceed.

Mr. MCELDOWNEY. It may perhaps be a trifle longer. I am James McEldowney. I appear here to give my own personal opinion. I have cut about half of this out.

Chairman LARCADE. Will you be seated.

Mr. MCELDOWNEY. I was just going to get my bearings.

I think anything that anyone would say at this time would be more or less anticlimax, but there are one or two points which might be of interest to the committee and to the people of this Territory.

Chairman LARCADE. May I ask at the outset: Are you for or against statehood?

Mr. MCELDOWNEY. I am neither for nor against. I believe it should be deferred.

According to newspaper reports, on the first day of this hearing, the first witness pointed out that Hawaii is taxed without representation. That position seems hardly tenable. This committee is here under a bill presented by the Delegate to the National House of Representatives to admit Hawaii to statehood. But accepting the statement as a fact, the condition has existed for only a matter of 47 years. Again quoting the witness:

No taxation without representation, and no government without the consent of the governed, are axioms as much alive and as important to the people of Hawaii today as they were to the Revolutionary fathers who first gave them utterance.

To paraphrase the late Mr. Wendell Willkie, if that is not mere statehood oratory, why did not some official, moved by that spirit, at some time during the 47 years seek a correction?

Comment has been made about the lack of local veteran aid legislation. The effect of national legislation, the so-called GI bill of rights, will be to immerse veterans in a mass of unpayable debt. Is it permissible to ask: Why should a veteran return to his homeland facing the necessity of buying a lot for a home site, some acreage for a farm, or a portion of his country for a business location? Why should he be expected, or coerced, into assuming a 10-year debt? Hawaii should and can inaugurate a better plan.

The Territory has not lagged in asking for and accepting money from the Nation for local projects, for welfare, roads, housing, legislative pay rolls, and other things. Maybe this attitude is due to erroneous thinking.

The National Treasury can disburse only the money it takes by taxation from the people in the States and Territories. The postwar rehabilitation committee of Iowa has reported that the tax or bond dollar will buy more if expended near where it is raised.

In 27 years of collecting and disbursing primary road funds, the Nation has returned to the States only 70 cents of the dollar collected. The loss sustained by each dollar on its journey to Washington and back is 30 percent.

Why be mulcted of 30 percent just for the fun of letting the National Treasury do part of the bookkeeping? How would statehood correct that?

Few objections to the lack of statehood are traced to our political status. They spring from economic pressures brought on by laws. They are the same as those found in California, Louisiana, New York, and Oregon. Statehood has not prevented unemployment, nor corrected the housing shortage, nor checked taxation, debt, and land control in those States. Why should it have any different effect in Hawaii?

Our troubles are not due to being under the Department of the Interior. They would exist just the same under the Department of Commerce, the Department of Agriculture, or the Department of Labor. Local problems have the same source as similar troubles in the States. That source is the Department of the Treasury. Those difficulties start from there because the Treasury controls our money. When it releases money on business borrowings, it does not release any dollars for interest on those borrowings. We have to take those dollars from each other.

When the effects and implications of that control are realized by the people of Hawaii, the political status of statehood will seem unimportant without the status of economic freedom.

Until there is local evidence that such freedom is desired, statehood should be deferred.

Chairman LARCADE. Thank you very much, sir.

(Mr. McEldowney at this time was excused and withdrew.)

Chairman LARCADE. Are there any other witnesses, Mr. Farrington? Delegate FARRINGTON. No.

Chairman LARCADE. The committee wishes to state that they have given every person of the Territory an opportunity to appear before

this committee, and we feel that since there are no other witnesses present, that we will now conclude our hearing.

Before doing so, I wish to file for the record, a statement presented to the committee by Mr. Roy Vitousek, chairman of the Central Republican Party of Hawaii. [Statement No. 25.]

I also wish to present for the record another exhibit, submitted by Mr. Roy Vitousek, chairman of the Territorial Central Committee of the Republican Party of Hawaii, giving certain statistical data. [Exhibit No. 76.]

I also submit a statement by a citizen named Manase Makekau, who requests that this statement be included in the record. [Statement No. 26.]

There is also a statement by Leon K. Sterling, city and county clerk, city of Honolulu, submitted on behalf of the Board of Supervisors of the City of Honolulu, and the Territory of Hawaii, which it is requested be made a part of the record. [Exhibit No. 77.]

There is also a statement presented to the committee to be included in the record by the president of the Junior Chamber of Commerce of Honolulu, attached to which is certain statistical data which it is requested be made a part of the record. [Exhibits Nos. 78A and B.]

Without objection from the members of the committee, these statements and briefs will be included in the record.

As has been announced many times by the members of the committee, any one who has any further statement or brief to file, either for or against the question under consideration, may do so, and the same will be included in the record of the proceedings.

AN UNIDENTIFIED MAN. Can I appear before your committee?

Chairman LARCADE. I am sorry, sir. We have been here 2 weeks, and we have called on people time and again to appear. You have given us no notice.

What is the nature of the testimony that you desire to present?

THE MAN. I appear solely on account of the release of the GI's in connection with this program of demobilization that they are advocating. I wish to appear to assist them, and ask the intervention of this congressional committee to intercede with the commanding general of this department of the Army to see that these boys who have been picked up are released from restriction to quarters or in arrest unless just charges can be made against those boys that would justify a prison sentence.

I appear solely as an individual myself only, but as a civilian, and an American citizen.

Chairman LARCADE. In reply to your request, sir, I wish to say that is a matter that is entirely irrelevant, and has nothing to do with the problems which this committee is considering. It is a matter that does not come within the jurisdiction of this committee. The committee has decided after consideration, that it is not within the province of their duty to accept any such statement, or any brief or evidence in connection with the matter which you mentioned, due to the fact that this committee is without authority to consider any such problem. So therefore we respectfully decline to undertake such a hearing.

It is a matter which would properly come before the Committee on Military Affairs of the House, and as such it is impossible for this committee to go into that question.

However, as individual members of this committee, I want to assure you that all of the members are giving full consideration to this question, and when they return to Washington they will exercise their privilege as members in an individual capacity, to take whatever action they see is appropriate in connection with this matter.

Representative ANGELL. I move that we adjourn.

Chairman LARCADE. In closing, ladies and gentlemen, on behalf of the committee, we desire to thank the people of the Territory of Hawaii, and the officials of the Territory of Hawaii for the fine support and hospitality that they have extended to this committee, and for the cooperation of all concerned. We also desire to express our appreciation of the splendid work of the press in covering these hearings in so able a fashion.

The hearing will now be concluded.

(Pursuant to the direction of the chairman at the close of the Kauai hearing, the address of Delegate Farrington, presented at the annual meeting of the Chamber of Commerce of Honolulu, Thursday, January 17, 1946, at 5 p. m., is inserted in the record at this point.)

This meeting of the Honolulu Chamber of Commerce comes as one of the concluding events of one of the most searching inquiries into the affairs of the Territory ever to be conducted by a committee of Congress.

Within a period of 3 weeks this committee has come from a distance of more than 5,000 miles and before it departs Saturday on the return voyage it will have visited each of the principal islands, held hearings in every county and received testimony both complete and expert on the problems and progress of the Territory, politically, economically, and socially.

It will return to Washington, therefore, with a record that covers virtually every aspect of our life in these islands, and an extraordinary knowledge of our people.

The case for statehood for Hawaii has been brought up to date. The committee has heard every conceivable statement, both pro and con, about this issue that can possibly be made.

It has been able to serve the spirit and purpose both of those who are in favor of statehood now, but were opposed to it.

It has very earnestly and frankly sought to place in the record all of the answers to any question that may be raised when this issue comes up for consideration in Congress.

It does not want to discourage other Members of the House and Senate from visiting Hawaii in the future, nor in any way deny them such an opportunity, but it nevertheless believes that its record is so complete that such visits will be unnecessary to the proper understanding of this very important question.

But the record alone does not tell the story in full. For every witness that has formally testified in the hearings, each member of the committee has undoubtedly listened to at least a hundred individuals of all races, creeds, and stations in life discuss the question.

It has received all kinds of letters, unfriendly and friendly, anonymous and signed, and innumerable telephone calls and callers.

Individually and collectively the committee has been so thoroughly exposed to our people and our life that its members cannot help but leave these islands with a basic knowledge of their people and problems, their hopes and aspirations that will equip them as are few other persons in our Federal Government to appraise our attitude, present ability, and capacity for carrying the responsibilities of American citizenship and advise Congress on all questions relating to our future.

This objective has been achieved not only as a result of the miracles of modern transportation, but by reason of the enthusiastic response of our people to all requests for information and to every inquiry.

The organization and its members is by no means the least of the civic agencies whose contribution to the work of the committee has been a really notable one.

The data and records it has provided on our industrial and commercial life will prove undoubtedly of great value.

I am happy to have the opportunity for my part to express my appreciation of the assistance you have provided, and am sure this goes also for the other members of the committee.

I wish also to take this occasion to express to the community generally and to the many public officials whose help has been of such great value, the same sentiments.

It is my feeling, as the time to depart approaches, that a good job has been done. This applies both to the members of this committee and to the people of the islands.

The industry of the committee has been enormous. Its response to the terrific demands on its time and energy has been so consistently generous and friendly that I have been afraid at times it was approaching a state of almost complete exhaustion.

I say without hesitation that each member has given to this task the full measure of his attention and energy.

So far as the people of the islands are concerned, I think it is self-evident that on all the islands they are alert to the great significance of this inquiry.

I am sure we all realize the vital importance to our future peace and happiness of these decisions that are now being made, and are anxious that whatever our part may be in that determination, that it be played with the full measure of our ability.

In closing, I thank you. I thank you and all the people of Hawaii Nei for the great contribution you have made to this important task assigned to this committee.

I thank you for providing, in your acts and words, a record of which I am proud and of which I am sure our fellow countrymen of the States will be proud.

I thank you for the great honor and privilege that has come to me to represent you in these important proceedings, and finally I thank the distinguished chairman of this committee and each of its members for the great service they have rendered and are still rendering Hawaii and, we believe, the entire country.

In this I am sure I express the sentiments of all the people of this Territory.

By the fine spirit and industry which they have carried on this proceeding, they have won not only the respect, but the lasting affection and aloha of Hawaii Nei. [Applause.]

(The following were filed with the committee after the hearings at Honolulu had been completed:)

HONOLULU, T. H., January 18, 1946.

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.,

Chairman, Subcommittee on the Statehood Bill,

Committee on the Territories, House of Representatives.

DEAR SIR: There is submitted herewith, with the request that the same be made a part of the record, the following:

Two schedules prepared by Dr. E. C. Auchter, Director of Pineapple Research Institute of Hawaii, as follows: One covering the comparison of the hourly wage in the pineapple industry with that of the food industry on the mainland, and the other showing the average annual earnings of all regular hourly rate employees on the pay roll during the past year in the pineapple industry. This data is given for both males and females in the Honolulu canneries and those canneries on islands other than Oahu. Similar data is given covering the average annual earnings on the plantations. Data which the seasonal employees in the canneries earn during a period which varies from 6 to 10 weeks at the peak season, are given. [Exhibits Nos. 79A and B.]

A schedule showing land held by the Federal Government in 1934 and at the present time. [Exhibit No. 80.]

Schedule showing tax collections, calendar year 1945. [Exhibit No. 81.]

Resolution of Hana Lika Club, favoring statehood. [Exhibit No. 82.]

Resolution of board of directors of the Federation of American Chinese Clubs, favoring statehood. [Exhibit No. 83.]

Statement of the Department of Labor and Industrial Relations, supplementing statement No. 12. [Statement No. 27.]

Six charts furnished by the Department of Labor and Industrial Relations showing workmen's compensation coverage on a comparative basis. [Exhibits Nos. 84a, b, c, d, e, and f.]

Statements of Colin G. Lennox, president, Board of Agriculture and Forestry, relating to ability of the Territory to produce its own requirements of fresh vegetables (statement No. 28) and relating to additional acreage available for sugarcane (statement No. 29.)

Statement of Gregg M. Sinclair, President of the University of Hawaii, listing members of University faculty who did war work. [Statement No. 30.]

Statement of the Territory's position on the 2-percent tax. [Statement No. 31.]

Respectfully,

A. M. G. ROBERTSON,
Counsel, Hawaii Equal Rights Commission.

JANUARY 18, 1946.

HON. HENRY L. LARCADE, Jr.,

*Chairman, Subcommittee on the Statehood Bill,
Committee on the Territories, House of Representatives.*

SIR: Pursuant to the request for information on juvenile delinquency made on January 15, 1946, when I was a witness on the subject of law enforcement, I transmit herewith the following:

Letter from Ray Madison, Captain, Crime Prevention Division, Honolulu Police Department, relating to reports obtained by him with respect to the islands of Maui, Hawaii, and Kauai. [Exhibit No. 85.]

Table from Norman C. Smith's survey of 1942 of Maui Youth Adrift, showing the 11-year average rate of delinquency for 1930-1940, for the first circuit (Oahu, Kalawao), (second circuit, Maui, Lanai, Molokai), third and fourth circuits combined (Hawaii—this entire island is now included in the third circuit, the fourth circuit having been eliminated since the date of preparation of this table), and fifth circuit (Kauai). [Exhibit No. 86.]

Table prepared by Captain Madison showing individual juveniles charged during 1945 by the Crime Prevention Division of the Honolulu Police Department. [Exhibit No. 87.]

Table prepared by Captain Madison showing individual juveniles charged during 1945 and referred by the Crime Prevention Division of the Honolulu Police Department to other departments, courts, or agencies. [Exhibit No. 88.]

Annual report for the year 1944 by Captain Madison, relating to juvenile delinquency in Honolulu. [Exhibit No. 89.]

Respectfully,

C. NILS TAVARES,
Attorney General of Hawaii.

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII

FRIDAY, JANUARY 18, 1946

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE TERRITORIES,
Lihue, Kauai, T. H.

The committee met at 2 p. m., Hon. Henry D. Larcade (chairman) presiding.

Present: Representative Henry D. Larcade, Louisiana, chairman; Representative George P. Miller, California, member; Representative Homer D. Angell, Oregon, member; Delegate Joseph R. Farrington, Hawaii, member; Irwin W. Silverman, Esq., chief counsel for House Territories subcommittee; C. Nils Tavares, Esq., attorney general, Hawaii.

Chairman LARCADE. Senator Fernandes, ladies and gentlemen, the meeting will come to order.

This is a subcommittee of the Committee on the Territories of the House of Representatives of the United States, which was sent to Hawaii for the purpose of holding hearings and making investigations with respect to legislation pending before the United States Congress, and foremost and primarily the subject of most interest, I think, at this time in the islands, is the question of statehood.

We have been on the islands nearly 2 weeks, and have held meetings in Honolulu and on the other islands, and it has been the desire of the committee to give every person and every citizen an opportunity to present their views and testify before the committee, and we have met with a very spontaneous reception in that respect, and we likewise repeat the invitation here.

While we have been submitted a list of those who desire to appear, after we shall have heard these witnesses if there is anyone else present here in this room who desires to testify for or against the questions under discussion by the committee, we will be glad to entertain their testimony, time permitting.

I see that the first witness that is listed to appear is Senator Clement Gomes. Will you please give your name and background?

Mr. GOMES. My name is Clement Gomes, and I was born and raised here on the islands, and with the exception of a year I served in the United States Army during the First World War I have lived here all my life. I am in the transportation and construction business, and am also a member of the legislature and have been one since 1924.

I wish to state at this time that I am 100 per cent for immediate statehood for Hawaii. From my experience, gentlemen, and I have been in politics, and knowing of the financial conditions here of these islands, I believe that the citizens here on these islands are qualified

to the same degree, and probably a little more, to become citizens of a State, than some of the citizens of some of the States of the Union.

I don't want to go into detail as to our qualifications, because, gentlemen, you have heard that time and time again in Honolulu, Maui, and Hawaii, and I would rather that you ask me some questions that you want answered, in case you want to know about the conditions or some of the conditions on this island, or of the Territory, and if I can answer them I will be very glad to do so.

Chairman LARCADE. Are there any questions by members of the committee?

Representative MILLER. Senator, you are a member of the American Legion, I see.

Mr. GOMES. Yes, sir.

Representative MILLER. I see the little tab over your button. That indicates what?

Mr. GOMES. It indicates that I have had 25 years of continuous membership in the Legion.

Representative MILLER. You are familiar with the charge that is sometimes made that certain groups on these islands may be disloyal. You have lived here in the islands all your life, and you are a Legionnaire. I would just like to have you tell me in your own words what you think of that statement.

Mr. GOMES. I am glad to answer that question. When I served in the Army in the First World War I served with Japanese, Portuguese, Chinese, Filipinos, Hawaiians, and all races that make up this great Territory, and I can sincerely say that they are 100 per cent Americans. There is no question, I believe, that in some of the States, and probably in the State you come from, California, that there are people that are racially prejudiced—there is no question about that, but from my own experience, and I am on to my fifty-fourth birthday, and from having lived here and having gone to school with the people of all races, I know that every boy and girl born here in this Territory are loyal American citizens, and we have shown it, especially from December 7, 1941, on, and we have shown it in every way. We have exceeded the record of any State of the Union in buying bonds, according to our population, and we have come through in every way and we have cooperated with the Army and Navy here. We did not growl about martial law but we all dug in and put our shoulders to the wheel and helped our country. I know, and I am speaking for myself, that I want to be a full American citizen where I will have a right to vote for Joe Farrington as one of the United States Senators, and for the Members of Congress, and for the great President of our great country, the United States of America, and I can speak as a member of the party, when I have represented them—represented the people here for 24 years, and I am speaking for them, and we ask for this in all sincerity, and that is from the bottom of my heart, gentlemen.

Chairman LARCADE. Any questions? Mr. Angell?

Representative ANGELL. Senator, you are familiar, of course, with the educational set-up here in your islands which we have visited, and I think this is the last one, and we have brought out testimony as to the character of the education, and the number of young people who

attend school. What would you say is the situation with respect to education on this island?

Mr. GOMES. I will be glad to answer that question. I am chairman of the Educational Committee in the Senate, and while in the House I was a member of the committee, and I wish to say that we have an educational system here in the Territory that is second to none, or to any State of the Union. In 1935 I had the pleasure of taking Jack Nichols, and a Senator from Virginia—I took them over to Hanalei—which is in a part of the island of Kauai that I am sorry you gentlemen have not had the opportunity to see—and if you gentlemen did not have to go back right away we would like to give you a ride over to this place—but I took this gentleman from Virginia over there, and we were discussing education, and I said “How much do you pay your school teachers in your State?” and he said, “A maximum of \$75 a month”; and I said, “We pay them \$150 a month here,” and while it costs a lot of money we are interested in having good teachers and in giving our children a good education and keeping the standards high.

Representative ANGELL. Do most of your children attend school?

Mr. GOMES. It is compulsory under our laws here, that they shall go to school from the age of 6 to 12, and now we have initiated, since 1925, kindergarten classes here in the island.

Representative ANGELL. You have had some experience with schools on the mainland, and I understand you sent your sons to school on the mainland. What have you to say about that?

Mr. GOMES. It was very good of you to ask me that.

Representative ANGELL. What would you say as to the comparison of your schools here with those on the mainland?

Mr. GOMES. When Mrs. Gomes took my son out to Pennsylvania to go to school there, the president of the college asked her: “Does your son speak English,” and he, like many others, did not know that we had the first high school west of the Rocky Mountains, where people from California sent their children from over there to Hawaii to get a high-school education, to Punahou.

I want to cut this short—your time is getting limited, but I want to point this out, in answer to your question, that there were 400 students in his Pennsylvania school, and my son came third in English, and I have the facts to prove it, so it shows that we do teach good English in the islands.

Representative MILLER. Mr. Chairman, if I may be permitted to ask another question.

Chairman LARCADE. Yes.

Representative MILLER. On the way over, Senator, we were having a discussion about some of the Japanese who have returned from the war, and you indicated to me that a large number of them had become Christians.

Mr. GOMES. Yes; that's right.

Representative MILLER. Will you go into that for a minute, please. It is important to show that there is this definite trend toward freedom in those things.

Mr. GOMES. That is true in a great measure. Of course I am a Christian by birth; my ancestors were all Catholics, and I am sorry I am not a graduate of St. Marys College, as I am aware you are. Now I am very friendly with the Catholic priest here, and he is con-

verting Japanese boys and girls, and some of them that were born in Japan joined with the Catholic religion, and I know for a fact, from my maid, that these boys that went over to Italy and to France, and after the American Armies conquered Rome, and Italy, that these boys on their off days would go down to Rome and they made it a point to visit the Vatican. They were given rosaries blessed by the Pope, and they sent them here by the hundreds, and upon their return here they will be receiving them here, and their parents and their brothers and sisters have joined or are taking instructions to become Catholic, and they have been baptizing them here by the dozen.

Representative MILLER. I see. Thank you.

Delegate FARRINGTON. Mr. Gomes, I think it would be of some interest to the members of the committee for you to tell them, for the record, that you were born in very modest circumstances, and are largely a self-educated man.

Mr. GOMES. Well, I wish to say that I am a self-made man. That just goes to show you, Mr. Angell, what good schools we have here. I am only a sixth-grade product, and had to stop at the sixth grade, but due to hard work and keeping my eyes open, and my ears open, and working hard, I have accomplished something and I think I have made a pretty good citizen.

Delegate FARRINGTON. In other words, you know what an education means?

Mr. GOMES. I know what it is, and I am glad you brought it out, Delegate Farrington. That is why in my years of service in the legislature I have given the greater portion of my time toward educational problems, and toward increasing the facilities of our schools here, because I believe a well-educated community is a well-Americanized community. I am a great believer in paying good salaries to our teachers, and in having modern schools, and in giving our children the best education that can be had.

Incidentally, I wish to point out that this island here, through legislation of which I was a proponent, this island of Kauai, is mandated by the legislature to furnish all books free, from the first grade to the twelfth grade, in all our schools here; that is, in the public schools the county buys, or pays for all the books.

Representative ANGELL. Do you have any foreign language schools?

Mr. GOMES. The session of 1943 outlawed any language schools. They can teach languages in schools after they have attained a fourth grade education. I believe that is right. The attorney general is here and can confirm it—Mr. Tavares, who can prove or disprove that. The teachers have to be American citizens and they have to pass an examination before they are allowed to teach any language; it doesn't matter what language it is; you can take it up in the University or after you have reached the fourth grade of education.

Chairman LARCADE. Senator, in view of your statement of your background, I think you are qualified to answer a question which I will ask you, but before asking the question I will tell you the reason why I am asking it. At one of the hearings on one of the other islands testimony was introduced to the effect that the witness was of the opinion that when the plebiscite was held in 1940 in the Territory that the people did not understand the subject, and they were not capable

of passing on such an important matter; that the matter was not explained to them, and they did not know what they were voting for.

Mr. GOMES. I presume that those who say that and made that statement were opposed to statehood?

Chairman LARCADE. That is correct.

Mr. GOMES. Well, I see. I wish to say that the people he had in mind, the citizens who he had in mind, and that is why they are opposed to statehood—that some of the most qualified people who have voted as citizens on these islands were these Japanese.

Chairman LARCADE. It is your opinion that they understood it?

Mr. GOMES. Yes; they understood. The boys and a great majority of the girls are high-school graduates, and I was one of those who was running for the Senate, for reelection, in 1940, and I talked for statehood and told them that we should have statehood, and so did my good friend, who used to be senator, Mr. Farrington. He is demoted now—I mean promoted.

Representative ANGELL. Senator, I think it would be interesting, and perhaps of interest to the committee, if you would state what your racial ancestry is, and that of your wife.

Mr. GOMES. I am Portugese, and my good friend, Representative Miller, stated that in the district where he comes from they have more Portugese than any other voters there, and I think in his district, where he comes from, in Oakland, they have more Portugese there than they have in Portugal. My wife's father is Chinese, who was born in China, and my mother-in-law is Portugese, and she was born in the old country, on the island of Madeira. I was born here in the Hawaiian Islands, and so was my wife, so she is half oriental and half-Portugese, and I am full Portugese, I was born here, though.

Representative ANGELL. I might ask one further question. I think it is of interest to the committee, and would be to Congress. It has been brought out in other meetings that the various racial derivations of the people here do not enter into the question of their associations, their political and social associations, and that they treat one another as equals, and they intermarry, and they attend social functions and of course go to the same schools, and they are gradually merging into a new type of citizen. What have you to say about that?

Mr. GOMES. That's right. There is a great intermarriage here; perhaps more so than in other places.

Representative ANGELL. Perhaps more so than in any other community in the United States?

Mr. GOMES. Yes. I believe in it.

Chairman LARCADE. Ladies and gentlemen, I desire to make an apology. The members of the committee were introduced at the luau, and I overlooked presenting them to you here when the meeting was opened, so at this time I will do that. However, it is not necessary for me to present to you one of the members of the committee, because he is so well and favorably known to all of you, and all I will have to do is to ask him to stand up: Your own Delegate, Mr. Farrington. [Applause.]

The next member I wish to introduce to you is Mr. Miller, a Democrat from California. [Applause.]

And on my right is the ranking Republican member of the Territories Committee, Congressman Angell from Oregon. [Applause.]

We have two more members of the committee, who are not present, Mr. Delaney of New York, a Democrat, and Mr. Taylor of New York, a Republican, so we have got an off-set there, because neither one of them came, and I want to apologize for them, but they were detained on other matters in connection with the work of the committee. However, we will try to proceed just the same as though they were present.

I also want to introduce at this time our general counsel from the Interior Department, Mr. I. W. Silverman. [Applause.]

The next witness listed for an appearance is Mrs. Alan Faye. Is Mrs. Faye present?

Mrs. ALAN FAYE. Yes. I am Mrs. Alan Faye.

Chairman LARCADE. You may proceed.

Mrs. FAYE. I have a statement here which I wish to read. [Statement No. 58.]

Chairman LARCADE. May I ask you in what capacity do you appear? Do you represent any organization, or are you appearing in your individual capacity?

Mrs. FAYE. As an individual. It is my maiden voyage in public. I have put some remarks at the end of my so-called brief, which I plan to read if there is time. This statement is my expressed opinion, and is not meant to be facetious, and except for a little plug for the Hawaiian Air Lines you will find it is not impertinent in any respect. It is an attempt to correlate various facts as our local situation presents them here, and to set forth our individual standards and show our country that we have a proper amount of pride and have confidence in ourselves and in our accomplishments.

I would like to say that I am submitting for the record, later, and I will just hand it over to you, two examples in proof of the existence of racial tolerance. One concerns the actions of a Chinese-Hawaiian boy, which in his capacity as a student of the public schools sufficiently demonstrates that, although he was only 17, he knew his duty as a citizen without anyone telling him. He is Wallace Naumu.

The other is Kazumi Miyamoto, who is also a pupil; a Japanese-American, and which to my way of thinking is definite proof that there is racial tolerance in the islands. He reiterates throughout the paper, and is talking about the situation in California, that there is a racial intolerance there which does not exist in these islands. This may take too long to read—I don't know.

Chairman LARCADE. May I suggest in view of the fact that we are behind our schedule, which we have to maintain, in order to return on time to Honolulu, if possible we would be glad to have you file this statement and then we would like to have you make such statements or observations as you might care to.

Mrs. FAYE. Mr. Chairman, it would be impossible to summarize it. I would much prefer to read it, and if you feel the time is too short to have me read all of it, and you wish to cut me short, you may do so.

Chairman LARCADE. If it is filed, you will have it in the record.

Mrs. FAYE. Yes, but I would like to have it come before the people in this audience, too.

Chairman LARCADE. Very well, you may proceed.

Mrs. FAYE. Gentlemen, I am for statehood for Hawaii for the following reasons:

By the time this subcommittee of the Committee for Territories has convinced the Committee for Territories of their publicly expressed belief that Hawaii should have statehood; and by the time the Committee for Territories has favorably reported out their recommendation for statehood for Hawaii to Congress; and by the time Congress has become convinced that Hawaii should have statehood—an idea alarming and quite controversial in some parts of our country—and legalized statehood for Hawaii, a long time will have passed by.

Proof of this is easily found in a study of past congressional legislation, in which cases, our Delegate, after a lag of quite some years and by special act of Congress, has succeeded in having the benefits of such legislation extended to the Territory of Hawaii.

Therefore, let us ask for statehood for the Territory of Hawaii now, so that in due course it may become an actuality.

That the people are ready for it has been proven in every respect to all those who care to examine the records submitted and the statements of our witnesses at the current subcommittee hearings.

It is my personal belief that we are now ready for it. That opinion is based on my first-hand knowledge of the people themselves here. It is not founded on casual, jolly relations with the cook in the kitchen. I am no government official or representative of large business interests. I am just that thing known in government forms as a "housewife."

I have worked and played with the people of all present immigrant and native groups in such roles as school teacher, night chaperon for a Y. W. C. A. basketball group, Y. W. C. A. committees of all sorts, and in such community enterprises as an elaborate celebration of July 4, 1941, undertaken in conjunction with the armed forces, to name only one such activity. I have been entertained in their homes and have entertained students and teachers in our home. I went with teachers and Y. W. C. A. groups to the family beach home, where we slept, ate, hiked, and swam together.

At this point, some people present will think I am talking too much about myself. It is not meant that way. How could my conviction about statehood for Hawaii be backed up without a detailed description of why I think so?

As a teacher, I was confidant and adviser for many sad personal problems and recipient of many gripes about the inequalities that unfortunately still exist in our democratic way of life. After the blitz, I instructed five classes in various types of American Red Cross first aid, in addition to educating them with regard to similar work which had been taught us by men of the United States Army during the year 1941.

Might I note that our local citizens proved themselves far superior in the practical application of first-aid theory than did a highly educated group, including University of California professors, to whom I taught ARC first aid in Berkeley, Calif., in 1943. In December 1941 it was my humiliating discovery to find that "the triangle bandage tourniquet" required by American Red Cross was inadequate for the hefty arms and legs of men. A local truck driver attended to that problem in an ingenious fashion—a strip of automobile tire inner tubing.

I have lived in Cleveland, Ohio, New York City, Easthampton, Mass., the central hill section of Kentucky and Berkeley, Calif.' Also, I have seen and listened to at least a thousand of our armed forces stationed here, or here on combat leave during the war. The Americans we have here in Hawaii are all right, too.

Considering another aspect of the situation, from what is admittedly a theoretical angle, being a "dependent Territory" might be inclined to make people of such a political set-up dependent and discouraged in their thinking concerning matters political. For example, many of us have felt depressed and frustrated during presidential campaigns, telling each other, "What's the use? We have no say in the business anyhow." Or, again, as in the case of congressional legislation favorable to the national interest but discriminatory to Territorial public or economic interests, we say, "Now look what Congress has done to us, even though we have here the largest Army post in the country, the largest naval base in the country—sometimes taxing local facilities quite some as was much apparent to us all during war days—and our Federal internal revenue returns from Hawaii for 1943 were \$76,482,263.26, thus topping 14 of the States and 2 other Territories. What are we anyway—a neglected stepchild? Well, what's the use? We have a say but no vote."

Possibly the independency of statehood would give us a finer independency of thought and action. It could be true, you know. Certainly all the government and business officials rushing through here since VJ-day on their way to points west keep publicly telling us that we're "the key" to the Pacific, so that being the forty-ninth State out in the Pacific seems a reasonable idea.

What so many people in our country have not yet grasped is that the new planes will not only make the distance between Hawaii and the States small, but if your constituents ever decide to get busy and use those planes, the trip to Hawaii will seem to them a very short one indeed. Be sure to tell them to travel over the Pacific by means of Hawaiian Airlines. Apparently, only men who fought the war over Japan and recent travelers of the Pacific air routes, like yourselves, seem to have a practical conception of this matter.

Perhaps there is some traditional, hide-bound thinking in our country about due for the ash can and those of you who hasten its disposal might find yourselves acclaimed as great leaders of public opinion.

We have been justly criticized for not having long ago attended to this business about fishing rights as ordered by Congress. The Governor and next legislature are sure to attend to that detail. We would appreciate having you people, who are in a position to do so, attend to the detail of seeing that Congress at long last gives us the rights due every American citizen.

We are used to visitors of all types who have notions about our being "hicks from the sticks" and say, "It's lovely and quiet here, but how can you bear to stay so remotely out of things?" Well, just everybody of importance comes here eventually, either for some kind of stay, or at least passing through. We listen intently to their talk and learn much. Also, we're great travelers, as our geographical position necessitates that. I think we are as well-informed as to national and world affairs as the average citizen of most States. That is another argument in favor of statehood for Hawaii.

The record of our war effort speaks for itself. It's poor taste to rave about any one war record—as General Doolittle feels impelled to do—for all loyal, conscientious citizens did their utmost, wherever their sphere of action happened to be located. However, I never saw here at any time, as I did on the mainland in 1943, people sweating out the war, standing in furtive lines, waiting for candy stores to open at 1 p. m. Lots of those people did not look much like "war effort material," but I kept mentally putting them at tables making surgical dressings for the wounded.

We sit here now and contemplate the confusion on the home front. Recently, a hitch-hiking soldier said to me, when I inquired about his points, "Oh, I've joined up again. I like it here. There's too much confusion at home." In comparison, it seems so peaceful and well-ordered here. Our problems? Yes, we have them, but they're so familiar, so well-understood. Gradually, we shall solve them and our generosity of spirit and tolerance will make it all so much easier and quicker than if we lost our tempers and flew at each other shrieking, "Mistakes—mistakes. You're to blame, not I." Such methods of procedure strike many of us as simply adding to present confusion and further delaying needed action and solution of problems. We much admire citizens like General Marshall, who quietly accepts his share of the blame and still maintains his sense of humor.

The people of this Territory know and use the spirit of cooperation. Sometimes we call it "aloha," just one of the many meanings of the word "aloha." We compromise, but we do not appease angry needlers of our emotions.

As a form of relaxation, our well-known writer of technical works on psychology has just written a book called "Calabashes and Kings", which might better be titled "The Book to End All Books About Hawaii." The author is Dr. Stanley Porteous of our local university. In it, he confirms a theory long held by some of us. That is, that the spirit of "aloh" as exemplified by the word "cooperation" was a present from the native Hawaiians to all immigrants coming to these shores. It is my idea that this gift has proven of greater value to us, both in terms of dollars and cents, and in increased joy of daily contacts, than the land that some of us acquired from some of them.

We have all given this principle of cooperation further practice under the peculiar and rare form of rule—martial law. Many of us believe that the finest cooperation between civilians and various branches of the armed forces, including their own cooperation amongst each other in that respect, existed here under that form of rule. Isolated examples of injustice can be cited, but for a long time, there have been channels available for the consideration of such grievances. Perhaps most of us civilians, who had direct and constant dealings with the military, will agree that there was cooperation at that time of an excellent order.

Most of us sincerely admire the words and actions of our one-time military ruler and always kindly friend, Gen. Robert Richardson. He is a true example of what we mean by "aloha" and "cooperation." His understanding of civilian difficulties here under war conditions, far surpassed even the unusual. Moreover, he never lost patience, tact, or courtesy when under civilian fire. The same, of course, is true of the deputies of Admiral Nimitz, in their relations with civilians and

other branches of the armed forces. Admiral Nimitz is a great admirer and friend of Hawaii, as we are of him. Some of us even think that this type of "cooperation," rather than "unification," might be the answer to a certain baffling problem in Washington—the proposed armed forces merger. Cooperation, as we understand it here, means an understanding of all our problems. If we operated so successfully under the natural handicaps of martial law, it should be obvious that as a State we would be able to make a still greater success of things.

Men belonging to the "All States Club" of the Civilian Housing 3 Pearl Harbor, who feel that we here have yet to learn "the niceties of life," might profitably turn their attention to the words of the Negro private, Army of the United States, who testified at a recent hearing in Honolulu. According to the Honolulu Advertiser he attended a hearing concerning civilian-service personnel strife, that sometimes troubles the local scene. After testimony by representatives of all branches of the armed forces and the police department, he said:

It seems to me that one of the troubles behind such disturbances is that there are here now a lot of recent arrivals from the mainland, who have not yet learned to understand and appreciate island traditions of generosity and hospitality. It is most evident that that soldier had been observing us with care and attention.

It appears that the men just referred to came to our statehood hearings and took up our valuable time with matters that could go through more regular, suitable channels. Should such channels ignore complaints, there are ways of circumventing that neglect in routine style. They seem to be recent arrivals here from various States, who do not like us and make no attempt to understand us.

To return to the chief topic. Perhaps the question should be stated not, Should Hawaii have statehood? but rather be stated, Should the other 48 States deserve to adopt as a sister a forty-ninth State with a spirit of generosity, courage, and humor comparable to that possessed by the Territory of Hawaii? Our representative to Congress is a good representative of the people here and we are proud of his mighty and tireless struggles in our behalf on matters of importance.

This stated opinion is not meant to be facetious—except the little plug for Hawaiian Airlines—or impertinent in any respect. It is an attempt to correlate various aspects of the local situation, present them from an individual standpoint and show our country that we have a proper amount of pride and self-confidence in ourselves and our accomplishments. Thank you for giving us your time and interest.

That is the end of the brief. We thank you for coming to Kauai to look us over.

Now here are the rest of the papers for the record.

Chairman LARCADE. Thank you very much. They will be received and filed with the record.

(Letter by Mrs. Fayé to the subcommittee, dated January 17, 1945, with accompanying exhibits and papers, being a copy of "Letter from the people" with comments, is received and marked: "Exhibit No. 90.")

(Document dated "January 17, 1945, Waimea, Kauai, T. H., together with paper entitled "A Young American With a Japanese Face" is received and marked: "Exhibit No. 91.")

(Letter from Mrs. Faye to the subcommittee, dated January 17, 1945, with accompanying paper entitled: "Topics Volunteered for Oral Talks by the Senior

English Class of Maimea High and Elementary School, September-December, 1944" is received and marked "Exhibit No. 92.")

Representative MILLER. With your permission, Mr. Chairman, I would like to have Mrs. Faye's background, and will ask Mrs. Faye to give us her racial background, because the printed words do not show her light complexion, her blue eyes and blonde hair.

Mrs. FAYE. Thank you. I have lived in Hawaii almost 17 years. I was born in Cleveland, Ohio, and I went to school at Mount Holyoke College and the University of Virginia, and my racial background is Irish on one side and on the other it goes back so far into so-called New England antiquity that I do not know.

Chairman LARCADE. Are there any further questions by members of the committee? (No response.)

I would like to state for the record that this is one of the finest statements on the question we have received since the hearings have opened. We thank you, Mrs. Faye, for your statement.

Mrs. FAYE. You can see why I could not summarize it.

Chairman LARCADE. Yes. Thank you very much.

(Mrs. Faye excused as a witness.)

Chairman LARCADE. The next witness listed to appear before the committee is Mr. A. Q. Marcallino.

Mr. MARCALLINO. Mr. Chairman and members of the congressional party, and ladies and gentlemen, my name is Antonio Q. Marcallino. I have a statement prepared, but to save time I will just refer to it as I go along.

Chairman LARCADE. You may proceed.

Mr. MARCALLINO. I was born in Honolulu of Portuguese parentage, my father having come to these islands as a whaler in the early 1870's. My family has lived in these islands ever since.

It has been my privilege to know Hawaii first as a monarchy, and then, with the overthrow of that monarchy, as a provisional government, awaiting annexation to the United States; then as the Republic of Hawaii, and then, from 1898 on, as a Territory of the United States.

Under all of these different forms of government, we of Hawaii have demonstrated our ability to govern ourselves, and our government has generally met with all the requirements expected of us, no matter what our government was. This holds especially true during all of that period that we have operated as a Territory of the United States of America.

These were years that we of Hawaii were trained for statehood, and from all the evidence that you of the Congress have heard submitted to you, I am sure that you have found that as students of good government, we have learned our lesson and that the people of Hawaii are prepared and ready at this time to assume all of the responsibilities that we must shoulder as a State of our great Union of States.

In your investigations you have met and you have heard peoples of all those races that go toward making our cosmopolitan population, argue on the pro and cons of statehood. You have had the opportunity of judging our qualifications. You have found our educational system to be the equal of the educational privileges accorded

to any of the young people of any of our regularly organized States. All of this has been a part of our education toward the requirements expected of us should we become a State.

I speak as one that has been a part of and has taken part in this program of preparation for statehood, since for some years I have been a member of our House of Representatives in the Territorial Legislature. I first ran for office and was elected in 1910, from Honolulu. In 1912 I ran for office again and was defeated by the small margin of 60 votes.

Early in 1914 I moved to Kauai and did not become a candidate for public office again until 1924. Since that year I have run for office every 2 years and excepting for three terms when I failed to be elected, I have been one of the Kauai four in the House of Representatives. In those campaigns where I failed to make the grade my failure of election was due entirely to differences of opinion on the questions of the day and these defeats were in no way attributable to any racial bloc having gone out to work for my defeat.

In all of these years I have been a sympathizer and strong supporter of any measure introduced in our legislature working toward statehood. It has been my sincere belief that Hawaii and the citizens who hold the right to vote are, and have been, ready to assume all of the responsibility of self-government accorded any American citizen of a full-fledged State.

I am not worried about any such bugbear as control of our electorate by any racial bloc. My experience has been that there is and will always be differences of opinion arising that do not make toward the people of any race voting only for a candidate of their same racial extraction because such candidate is born of that race.

I say this because of my own experiences. Perhaps more than any other candidate who has been elected continuously to office from this island, I experience the most difficult time winning an election. There are many voters of my own race who will not vote for me. The reason for this being, mostly, that many a voter will not vote for a candidate that is looked upon as being too close to the big interests. My business affiliations are such that I, in some ways, qualify for such opinion. Yet I have yet to see the time when any of the big interests have asked me to support any measure that benefits them to the exclusion of the best interests of our Territory.

In order to be elected, therefore, I have got to depend on getting the vote of enough citizens of the other racial extractions that make up our electorate. I have many strong supporters amongst the voters of these other races. Of all these races, the Japanese and Hawaiians are in the majority. Just before the war started, our registration of voters showed that close to 50 percent of our entire island electorate was made up of voters of the Japanese race.

From this, if these citizens voted by bloc, you might say that any candidate of the Japanese race who stood for office would be elected. This has not been the case, however, for very often, in these years just before the war, some candidate of the Japanese race would be defeated in a race for office, even when opposed by a candidate whose race was registered in a very small minority.

As an example, I refer particularly to two office holders in our county government. Both of these young men are of the Chinese race, and

have held the same office for many years. There are only about 300 voters of their race eligible to vote. Both of these office holders have, on occasion, been opposed by candidates of the majority Japanese race, yet, in every instance, our Chinese candidate has won out handsomely. It is an established fact that most of these voters will only vote for the candidate whom they consider is the best qualified to hold that office.

To my way of thinking, this will always be true. Many factors enter into the picture that will always make for differences of opinion on the merits and qualifications of one candidate as compared to another. The factor of race will always be a minor consideration.

There are many things that will work against a Japanese always voting for a Japanese because he is a Japanese, or a Portuguese voting for a Portuguese because he is a Portuguese. Take in my own case, gentlemen, I don't think that 50 percent of the Portuguese residing on this island vote for me; not because they don't think that I am qualified and haven't done a fair job in the years I have been a member of the legislature; that does not enter into the picture, but because I have been employed by those whom they call the Big Five. Things like that will always enter into the picture.

Now to speak of those candidates of the Japanese race who have at one time or another been elected to office: We have had as many as three at one time serve as members of our five-man board of supervisors. During one session of the Territorial legislature, our island had two elected as members of the house of representatives. My observation has been that, in every way, these young men conducted themselves in office with honor and credit to themselves and to our Territory. During the years that our country was at war, none of these men stood for office, feeling that for the best interests of the Territory it might be better if they took no part in our government.

Although refused consideration as draftee material, many of these young men volunteered for service in our armed forces, and there is no need for me to mention how excellently they conducted themselves as soldiers of our country in Italy, France, Germany, and also in the Pacific. Those that remained at home took part in any and all of our endeavors toward rendering help to our country. Their record as citizens of our great country speaks for itself. Hawaii is justly proud of these young citizens.

In 1940 we had 7,735 voters registered on this island. This was the year we held our plebiscite on statehood: 6,635 votes were cast at that time; 4,460 voted "yes," and only 1,669 voted "no"; 290 votes were rejected, and 218 did not vote at all. That vote ran two and a half to one, and I feel certain that were the question of statehood referred to the electorate again at this time that the answer would again be very much the same.

I am of the opinion, gentlemen, that Hawaii is in every way prepared to take on the responsibilities of becoming a full-fledged State of our great Union. In the 48 years that have elapsed since we became a Territory, we have governed ourselves with credit. In every way we have met the requirements our mother government has imposed upon us. Although our Congress has the right of review and of correction of any legislation that may be passed or enacted by our legislature, at no time has it been necessary for Congress to take us to task for the passage of such legislation.

I repeat again that your committee in its deliberations has found Hawaii equal to the demands expected of us as a State. I submit, therefore, gentlemen, that you can do naught else but to recommend to our Congress that Hawaii be granted the privilege of becoming the forty-ninth State of our Union of States.

Chairman LARCADE. Thank you very much.

Delegate FARRINGTON. I would like to ask consent that Mr. Marcallino's statement be incorporated into the record; that he be extended that courtesy.

Chairman LARCADE. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

(The portions of the statement of Mr. Marcallino that were not read have been incorporated into the foregoing statement of witness Marcallino.)

(Mr. Marcallino excused as a witness.)

Chairman LARCADE. The next witness to be heard will be Mr. S. S. Henriques.

Mr. MANUEL S. HENRIQUES. My name is Manuel S. Henriques. I understand, Mr. Chairman, that there is very limited time left for the speakers, and I had been prepared to speak for an hour on a couple of matters here, but I see time does not permit, and I wanted to dwell on the issues pertaining to statehood, and which I favor, and which I wanted to clarify in the minds of the members of this committee, but time does not permit, and so I am prepared to take as much time as you may permit and am prepared to submit the entire statement to you, Mr. Chairman and honorable members of this committee.

Chairman LARCADE. Do you have a statement you desire to file?

Mr. HENRIQUES. Well, I don't think I will file it now, because I have other things following, but the record perhaps will show that.

Chairman LARCADE. You may read it.

Mr. HENRIQUES. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and honorable members of this committee. May I be permitted to add to your welcome to these our Hawaiian shores.

In behalf of the people of this island, the old and the hale, the small and the big, I join my fellowmen in wishing you a pleasant visit and please accept, if you should desire, our offer to assist you in whatever manner we may.

We in Hawaii feel that we have become of age. We have followed your pattern of representative government, our schools are well advanced, our population literate, the citizens of this land loyal to one master, Uncle Sam.

Your constitution has followed Old Glory here. We would like to add glory to Old Glory by affixing to her luminous stars, another star, the forty-ninth star, which will kindle the path across this broad Pacific with that priceless thing called freedom.

Gentlemen, it is in your power to grant us statehood. "And as ye would that man should do to you, do ye also to them likewise." So spoke Christ at one of his great outdoor meetings in the plains where a great multitude from out of all Judea and Jerusalem had come to hear Him. So now speak to your brother Americans of the Territory of Hawaii: Give us statehood.

Gentlemen, one of the points argued by the mainland people and particularly by a number of mainland newspapers has been and still is that there is a great number of Japanese in Hawaii, and that on this

account statehood for Hawaii would not be a healthy thing. We don't have here Japanese voters, but citizen voters; one cannot vote in this Territory unless he or she is a citizen, a resident and duly registered voter. These are the qualifications, or some of the qualifications. There are no Japanese voters here as a race. They may be referred to as Japanese, but not otherwise.

I have mingled with this people for over 40 years, and known this people to be loyal citizens to the United States of America. In past years the Japanese were brought here to work in the fields of the plantations. They proved to be excellent workers, and they remained here as such. Their children were born here under the laws of our country and are citizens of the United States. This right has been conferred upon them by our Constitution. Why, then, so much discrimination? In business, fishing, mercantile, professions, they are in the lead. They have made a success. They are an industrial people. Why, then, create a racial issue? The police force has a great number of these citizens in it.

In the banks, the Kapaa Bank and the Bishop Bank at Koloa, the managers of these banks are citizens of Japanese ancestry. At Waimea and Lihue banks a great number of citizens of Japanese ancestry are employed. In the plantation offices; in the plantation stores and in every large, important business house in this island you will see citizens of this race being employed, and occupying key positions. In the Territorial offices in this island, and in the county offices in this island, you will find citizens of Japanese ancestry holding important jobs, and in big numbers. The county engineer of this county is a citizen of Japanese ancestry, and has been for many long years. The secretary to our chairman of the board of supervisors of this county is a citizen of Japanese ancestry. The clerk of the circuit court of this circuit is a citizen of Japanese ancestry, and one of the best shorthand stenographers in the Territory. Many other citizens of Japanese ancestry are employed in various jobs in our local circuit court.

In 1941, in December, when the forces of Japan attacked Pearl Harbor, that very morning of December 7, 1941, the people of this island responded to the sound of danger to our homes, to our country—every race. At Kapaa, under the O. C. D., people of all races, all Americans, raced to offer their services. The majority were citizens of Japanese ancestry. Some of them were receiving higher salaries, and still their remuneration for 12 hours of work was \$3. These citizens, as all others, were assigned to patrol our beaches, several strategic positions, water tanks, and also reservoirs; the telephone installations, all the bridges, the landings, and every place that needed to be closely watched. Attacked by Japanese forces, still these citizens of Japanese ancestry did not vacillate, they stood guard at night and by day to safeguard our homes, our property, from a possible invasion. The National Guard was called, and a good number of these were citizens of Japanese ancestry. There never was a discordant note in their work; they were always faithful and loyal, obeying orders here and there. And this condition, the conditions I have just related, continued for over a long time.

I was a guard myself, doing 12 hours of work, for a remuneration of \$3 for a time. I became a clerk in the OCD, and again, executive officer of the OCD, for a long time, until this office went out of

existence. In such a capacity in this large district of Kawaihau, I had to issue passes, day and night, and emergency passes to citizens and noncitizens, and even permits for them to move from one house to another, and permits also to buy bottles of poison, for instance, iodine. They came to my office even for gasoline, for emergency cases; for instance, to take their sick people to the hospitals. Black out was here for a long time. The mainland people did not suffer what we in Hawaii suffered, by being deprived of practically everything; we had no butter, no meat, and many other things necessary to life, but we did not complain. Our aim was to make sacrifices so that our boys could be clothed with everything they needed, and could fight the enemies of our homes and of our country.

Arms and ammunition, according to orders, were turned over to the OCD office, and an inventory was kept of all property. Even the Mikado pictures, the royal family pictures, Japanese warship pictures, were turned over to the OCD according to orders. All poison in the stores was confiscated, and even firecrackers. This was all done by orders of the Army, and nobody complained.

These people behave themselves as true citizens, and the subjects of the Japanese Empire obeyed orders. They were not permitted to be out of their homes after 6 o'clock. The aliens—Japanese—were not permitted to attend a movie show, for the duration of the war. They obeyed orders. Not a single case of insubordination ever occurred. But these things are unknown to the mainland people, and to the mainland people, and to the mainland newspapers, and to some Members of our Congress; and if it is known, for unknown reasons it is not accepted truly, but when the opportunity arises for statehood the bugaboo of the Japanese control in Hawaii is the only topic, except at times it is also the Big Five.

Gentlemen, there is no such thing as a Big Five control and a Japanese control of Hawaii. If the Big Five had some political control in years past, it has disappeared, and it will never again be resuscitated. The mainland papers now and then bitterly attacked our request for statehood, but I firmly believe they are not well informed of our internal situation. I was a newspaperman myself years ago, and I know what I was requested to do.

Gentlemen, this bugaboo, this fear of the Japanese control of Hawaii, does not exist and could only exist in the brains of feeble individuals. It is all unfounded. Here in Hawaii, when one lives long enough, he knows this is not the case.

It is admitted that the Japanese population is large here; that the citizens of Japanese ancestry are in a large number. These people are true, loyal Americans, and they have proved it time and again and will be true and loyal Americans. They own homes, and they own large tracts of land; they are fine farmers, and if it was not for them we would have no vegetables at all but would be dependent on those coming in from the mainland.

I will cite a tabulation of voters of Kauai County for the year 1942. It is by districts; but I have a summary of the total number of voters, by race. This was in 1942. Subsequently the secretary of Hawaii ruled out that listing of voters; that they were not to be segregated. It shows: Japanese, registered, 3,760; votes cast, 2,942. All other

racers: Registered, 3,734; votes cast, 2,698. These people registered to the limit. Other races are indifferent, to a certain extent.

In 1942 no citizens of Japanese ancestry held office. The few holding office resigned on account of the war, but this was not because they were not good Americans; they felt that as Japan was at war with the United States they should be out of public office. That was a big mistake. I would not have done so. As true Americans they felt this way, and they have not sought office ever since then.

It has been claimed that citizens of Japanese ancestry control the political situation in Hawaii. We have had one citizen of Japanese ancestry in the senate; two in the house. In the senate this took place when there was a political machine there, which existed for over 20 years, but it was smashed at the last election by labor, and this political machine would never gain strength to survive. But this machine was not limited to citizens or voters of Japanese ancestry.

In the house there have been few, if my memory is right. We had once 2, and again 1, and this out of 30 members. What a control! What a political control! And this fear still exists in the minds of millions of people. But we in Hawaii do not fear any such political control. If these people were in control of our political structure they could easily have elected any number of candidates they wanted but this was not possible and would never be possible. And even if they control Hawaii politically, what of it? Are they not American citizens? They are citizens by birth; not one of them by naturalization. They are entitled to be treated as such under our Constitution and to exercise their rights as such citizens of the United States by right of birth. After all, we are Americans; we don't vote by race; we don't do things here by race. We all work together for the good of Hawaii; for the good of the United States and our country. Under our organic act, granted us by the Congress of the United States, we all, irrespective of race or creed, as long as we are Americans—we have the right to vote, the right to run for office, and the right to vote according to the dictates of our own conscience. We are just as good Americans as those on the mainland. Why are we discriminated against? I feel this is unfair; that it is not within the spirit of our Constitution and that it is contrary to our rights as free citizens.

In the board of supervisors of this country there are four members and one chairman; five. We had in the past two citizens of Japanese ancestry on the Board; one of them, Mr. N. Miyake, one of the best men we ever had on this board, who ran our county finances. They have been good servants of the people, working for the welfare of the people and not for those of Japanese ancestry, and there is nobody who could truthfully say otherwise.

The supervisors of the county of Kauai have been cited time and again as the best county in the Territory, and this statement has been made by the great old man Sanford Dole and by many men in high positions in the Territory. We never went in the red, but there are other countries that have gone in the red. This country has even paid obligations of the Territory; and as it is known that our financial condition and situation is such, advantage has been taken of the matter. We have been directed to pay bonuses to laborers, a Territorial obligation, but other countries in the Territory have gone to their assistance.

This Japanese control of our political situation is only a bugaboo and nothing more. They could have controlled every political position if what they say was true. Look at our schools. A great number of teachers are of Japanese ancestry; but they are true citizens, loyal to the United States of America; now, and they are were before the war. There never was a time when their Americanism could be doubted. A visit to our schools would be sufficient to prove this assertion. Every morning, gentlemen, everywhere in the schools of this island, as throughout the Territory, when those attending these schools—and the majority are citizens of Japanese ancestry—they salute our flag, the flag of our country; small kids, big boys and girls; they all gaze at Old Glory with pride, with devotion and with respect, as the symbol of our Nation; and they gaze at the beautiful square, 6 x 8—and do you know why they gaze at this square? Yes, gentlemen; they gaze at that square, 6 by 8, with the aspiration of some day seeing it changed from 6 by 8 to 7 by 7. These kids, and the boys and girls of all ages, and citizens of all races, mingle together as friends, as brothers and sisters, as children of our country, and not as Japanese, Chinese, or Portuguese. They have aspired and still aspire for the day when Congress of the United States will give us statehood and will accept us as members, the same as the other States. They gaze with pride at Old Glory, at that glorious flag that is unbeaten; at that beautiful square, at present containing 48 stars, but we are hoping for the day when it will be changed to 49 stars. What a day that will be for Hawaii! What a glorious day!

Citizens of Japanese ancestry have contributed to the cause of the war tremendously. They have bought bonds in large amounts. They have offered their services toward the sale of several articles, through the radio; small things, bought for large sums of money, and bonds to those amounts were issued upon payment. A large number of these people have offered their services as clerks, as checkers, and in other positions, so that the sale of the bonds would be a success. They have joined the Red Cross, units of the OCD, in every district, as a patriotic duty; as a duty to their country and to Hawaii, their home, their land of birth. I have lists of all those who were members of the various units, which I could read if there was time.

Now, what do you think of these people? Do you believe that there is any justification to doubt these people? Gentlemen, whoever does that is unreasonable. In these lists the majority, or more than the majority, are citizens of Japanese ancestry. They have sold over \$2,500,000 of bonds amongst their people, up to September 30, 1945. They have collected books, maps, pictures, and other valuable information for the Naval Intelligence, in Kauai.

More than 15,000 persons in Kauai were contacted, and more than 10,000 pamphlets were distributed to the people by committees of this race, amongst the Japanese. They have contributed more than 1,200 flags to the families who had men in the services—and I am one of them—and these flags were distributed by Army officers throughout the island at proper ceremonies. They have distributed over 2,000 copies of instructions covering the GI bill of rights, to veterans and families of the veterans of this war. They have liquidated their language schools in this island 100 percent. There is no vestige of a Japanese

language school here, and this was done by them. And never will there be another Japanese language school here.

The various races in this island have done business with Japanese, who ran stores and other businesses, and all the races in Hawaii were all as one; they were true children of Uncle Sam. Even when the Philippines were attacked, there was here a furious attitude on the part of the Filipinos, but they never did a single act of revenge to the Japanese here. Why? Of course, it was because these people here were not responsible for the acts of the Japanese Empire.

They have contributed \$30,000 to the following causes: \$13,000 to Army relief, \$2,500 to Army Red Cross; \$2,000 to the USO; \$1,200 to the Xmas fund for our boys overseas. What do you think of it, gentlemen? Are these citizens a danger, a menace, to Hawaii, or to the United States, their land of birth? Oh, no. I know you will agree with me, because you are broad-minded.

There is no place in the whole of the United States where so many races live as in Hawaii; but at this critical time, at the time of the attack on Pearl Harbor, on Hawaii, where our fleet was badly smashed, where hundreds of soldiers and sailors and civilians died at the outbreak of the war with Japan, and when the papers and the radio brought news about the atrocities committed by the armed forces of Japan in the Philippines, irrespective of the high, tense sentiment of the Filipinos here, not one ever attempted any act toward these people. And they all worked together at the OGD. In the fields of the plantations and in the mills, and everywhere, they came into daily contact, and everywhere they would meet and they would talk; in the stores, in shops, and everywhere. Have you ever heard of such a thing before? I believe this is unprecedented. And still the mainland people, the mainland newspapers, and a few right here in Hawaii are now accusing these people and are of the opinion that as the greater number of people in Hawaii are of Japanese ancestry, our right to statehood cannot be granted. Gentlemen, we are entitled to different treatment, as citizens of the United States. We are just as good Americans as those of the other States.

We in Hawaii, citizens, of different races, were exposed to the dangers of war more than any part of the mainland. We in Hawaii received the first baptism of fire from the aggressor. We in Hawaii have saved the whole mainland from danger.

Citizens of Japanese ancestry were refused admission in the armed forces. These citizens offered their services but were turned down. Finally our Government decided to accept them; 11,000 citizens of Japanese ancestry joined the colors of our country. They were good soldiers, fine young men, who were ready to die for the country of their birth—America, and not Japan.

Up to June 18, 1945, the casualties among them were 2,111—that is, in the European theater of the war—as follows: Killed in action, 361; died of wounds, 59; missing in action, 34; captured, 6; wounded, 1,651.

They have received meritorious citations as good soldiers, as follows: Presidential citations, 2; division citations, 64; Distinguished Service Crosses, 31; Silver Stars, 183; Bronze Stars, 218; Purple Hearts, 3,007.

Six hundred interpreters were inducted and twenty-six Wacs also.

The One Hundredth Infantry Battalion, composed of citizens of Japanese ancestry, was the most decorated unit in the United States

Army; but they decorated them by the Government of the United States, not by citizen officers of Japanese ancestry.

The Keawe cooperative put in 60,000 working days, consisting of clearing fields of fire, planting barbed-wire-entanglement posts, building Army quarters, putting up barbed-wire fences, and doing many other jobs. This was done for the Army and was volunteer work. They dug shelters in our schools on Sundays, and they were in charge of evacuation.

The Army authorities have congratulated those in charge of all these different works, the morale and emergency service committee, for the promotion of security and the general war effort in Hawaii, saying:

Through the war without a single racial conflict, proved sabotage, or subversive activity on the part of the people of Japanese ancestry but, on the contrary, a record of cooperation and loyalty on their part.

I thank you. Do you wish me to file this statement from which I have read, or is it to be filed later?

Chairman LARCADE. You may file it right now with the clerk.

Representative ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the witness if he will state for the record his background and racial ancestry.

Mr. HENRIQUES. I came to these islands from the island of Madeira, Portugal, at the age of 17 years, and I was accompanied by a sister and my brother-in-law. My mother was dead, and my father was living there. I came here. I did not know a single word in English.

When I came here I was sent to the Waialua plantation, on the island of Oahu, where I worked in the canefields as a waterboy, carrying water to a large gang of men, and cutting cane, and doing other work. I worked in the mill of the plantation, and I worked for a saloonkeeper down there, Mr. J. P. Medeiros, and I worked for a Mr. Alexander, a Portuguese at Waialua; and then I came to Honolulu, where I was employed by the big firm of Gonsalves & Montana; and I began reading English and making friends with people, and by hard work I learned the language. Let's say I am a self-made man—and I am proud of it.

Representative ANGELL. Thank you very much. I think that sufficiently answers the question.

Mr. HENRIQUES. I thank you, gentlemen, for this opportunity to come before you.

(Mr. Henriques is excused as a witness.)

Chairman LARCADE. The next witness is Mr. William Paia.

Mr. WILLIAM PAIA. Mr. Chairman and members of the House committee, ladies and gentlemen, my name is William Paia, and I appear on behalf of the International Longshoremen and Warehousemen's Union, CIO, Local 149, of Hawaii. Our 3,500 members strongly urge the House Committee or the Territories to recommend to the Congress of the United States the granting of immediate statehood to the Territory of Hawaii. Now is the time for statehood. The ILWU Local 149, feels because the people of Kauai have broken their chain of feudalism, that we are prepared to fill and shape our own destiny. We ask only for the democratic privileges and rights which we are entitled to as a free people. We ask only for what the United States granted to the people of the world, the fullest extension of democracy consistent with ability to govern. I thank you.

Chairman LARCADE. Are there any questions by members of the committee?

Representative MILLER. Mr. Paia, are you familiar with the subject, or have you given any thought to the so-called charge of bloc voting that some people seem to fear down here? I might say that I can subscribe to bloc voting myself when they all vote Democratic.

Mr. PAIA. We have no fear of bloc voting.

Representative MILLER. In your organization I presume you have people of all racial groups?

Mr. PAIA. Yes.

Representative MILLER. You have people of all opinions in these different groups?

Mr. PAIA. Yes; we have all grades, and all nationals in the Union.

Representative MILLER. That is, I mean people of all origins?

Mr. PAIA. Yes; of all origins.

Representative MILLER. Is it not true that just as the people who may represent management may be dictated by selfish interest, so your people, instead of voting as Chinese, Japanese, or Hawaiians, or whatever race, would be more apt to vote in their own economic interests?

Mr. PAIA. Yes; just like they do to-day.

Chairman LARCADE. Thank you.

(Mr. Paia is excused as a witness.)

Chairman LARCADE. The next witness is Mr. Noboru Miyake.

Mr. NOBORU MIYAKE. Mr. Chairman, Members of Congress, ladies and gentlemen, Noboru Miyake is my name, and I was born on this island, and I am a citizen of Japanese ancestry. I served in the First World War, and three of my brothers served in the First World War, and three of them served in this World War, and many other of my relatives; nine of them altogether. My father was an immigrant, an early immigrant, who came to Hawaii in 1884, and I am of the second generation, and a third generation is rapidly growing up.

I believe the Territory of Hawaii is ready for statehood. I have watched the statehood hearings with much interest, and have been greatly impressed with the favorable attitude of the people of Hawaii for statehood.

It is not improbable that if another statehood plebiscite is taken today the vote will be three to one in favor of statehood. The people of Hawaii have amply demonstrated their ability to govern themselves under trying conditions during the last 50 years as a Territory. The loyalty and the integrity of the citizens are beyond question. It has been proven not only once, but twice, in the short period of 25 years, during World War I and World War II.

It is fundamental that true democracy cannot be assured unless all the citizens are given all the privileges of freedom—freedom of speech, freedom of religion, and all the freedoms, and also the right to elect all government officials by popular vote.

Some of the opponents of statehood have said "Why clamor for statehood now? We have been doing well as a Territory." And they call attention to the menace, as they say, of bloc voting, and the danger from the Big Five, but that has not been found to be true, from statistics and from all other information available.

It is true that we have done a splendid job in the war and in peace, as a Territory, but we must be awakened to the fact that actually we

are an overgrown Territory with all the qualifications for statehood. We pay into the United States Treasury taxes in excess of many of the States of the Union. Our economic condition is sound. Our health and educational facilities compare favorably with the States; and, lastly, our labor situation has improved to the extent that the balance of power between capital and labor is rapidly approaching.

We must also realize that Hawaii's main source of income is sugar and pineapples, which is interstate commerce, and the enactment of any legislation by Congress adversely affecting Hawaii will seriously affect our economy. The question of the economic control of Hawaii by the big interests has been greatly exaggerated. It is true that some control is evident, which is inevitable in our capitalistic system, and the same thing holds true in any civilized country. On the contrary, I believe the pioneers of Hawaii deserve all the credit, both labor and capital, for making Hawaii what it is, as it stands today on the cross-roads of the Pacific.

It is important to us to realize that less than 50,000 men are estimated to be employed in Hawaii's major industries, sugar and pineapple. A large part of the population is largely interdependent on these main sources of income, and under the circumstances the continued prosperity of Hawaii largely depends on Congress unless Hawaii becomes a State. I thank you.

Chairman LARCADE. I have been handed a memorandum, which I would like to check on now. I understand you are a former member of the Board of Supervisors of this District, but you declined to run for reelection in 1942, due to the possibility of mainland criticism against citizens of Japanese ancestry holding office during a war with Japan, is that correct?

Mr. MIYAKE. Yes.

Chairman LARCADE. You were the head of the panel on gasoline rationing during the period of the war? You were the chairman?

Mr. MIYAKE. Yes.

Chairman LARCADE. You are a veteran of World War I, and at present commander of the Kauai Post of the American Legion, and manager of Waimea Electric Co. and Waimea Garage, Ltd., local Plymouth and Chrysler dealer?

Mr. MIYAKE. Yes.

Chairman LARCADE. Are there any further questions by members of the Committee?

Representative MILLER. How many members are there in Kauai, of the American Legion?

Mr. MIYAKE. We have approximately 200 right now.

Representative MILLER. Are they all of one racial group?

Mr. MIYAKE. No. The majority of the members right now, of the World War I Veterans, are primarily Hawaiians and all mixed races.

Representative MILLER. And regardless of that, and with the votes of the veterans of World War I, you were elected commander of that post?

Mr. MIYAKE. Yes.

(Mr. Miyake excused as a witness.)

Chairman LARCADE. Is there any citizen present who desires to appear before the committee at this time for or against statehood? If there are, we would be glad to have him step forward.

Mr. WILLIAM A. FERNANDES. I would like to appear before the committee.

Chairman LARCADE. Give your name and business and a short synopsis of your background, please.

Mr. FERNANDES. My name is William A. Fernandes, and I am the proprietor of a Maui picture theater. Formerly I was a member of the legislature, and I was in two sessions of the house of representatives.

Mr. Chairman and members of the statehood committee, I was born on the island of Maui, one of the islands of the Territory, and I have resided here all my life. I have been a member of the legislature for two sessions, 1924 and 1931, and I am 100 percent for statehood, and I believe the majority of the people of these islands are for statehood. If we have to go and have a plebiscite vote again I think it will show a vote of over 4 to 1 for statehood.

Now in a government run by the people, it is always the best form of government. At the present time our Governor is appointed by the President of the United States and with the approval of the Senate of the Congress. There have been governors appointed that we have never heard of; that we never knew of in political life. We have lots of good men all over in the Territory, and somehow, although it is recommended by both parties, the Republican Party and the Democratic Party, somehow the man who has never been heard of has been appointed, regardless of these recommendations.

Now the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, between the house of representatives and the senate, sometimes do not function right with the governor, who is appointed by the President, and if you had a governor who had been elected by the people of these islands he will be a governor that will work more together with and cooperate with the people of this Territory.

There is another thing that we will have, probably, if we become a State; that is, we will have the right to elect two Senators and probably two Representatives to represent us in Congress, so we will be better represented than we are now, but the way we are going we are just going along with a government that is not really ruled by the people.

There has been so much talk about the Big Five, about their ruling this country, or running this country. It is not so. I have been living here all my life, and I have been in business for 35 years for myself. I have never worked for the Big Five, and I can say that many of us in the Territory of Hawaii have lived for ourselves and worked for ourselves, and have not been connected with the Big Five in running our business, and that applies to all kinds of businesses.

Now this country depends on agriculture—that is sugar and pineapples. They say it is these families, or the Big Five, that have worked so hard to develop these islands, but this is what you call a wild country; nothing but rocks, and wild forests, and it was with hard work that they have developed these islands, with hardly any capital, or with very little capital, and they have developed these islands and we have come to a time now that these islands are one of the richest and most prosperous countries in the world for the number of people that we have.

We are running now to a population of about 450,000 people, or a little more. We are paying taxes to the Federal Government—and if my figures are not accurate I will be pardoned—but as I understand it we are paying more than 17 States of the Union. Now some of those States are much larger in area, are much larger in population, and here in Hawaii we just have 450,000 people; and, when we come to the production of this country here and what we have done for the United States mainland, we are paying more taxes than 17 States of the Union to the Federal Government, which shows that we are prosperous.

During the last World War, or after the last World War, it was several years afterward, the country went through a depression, which was common throughout the United States, and was also here in Hawaii, but here in Hawaii, during the depression, we did not feel it very much. Here in Hawaii everybody was working, and there were no bread lines, and everybody had a job, and there was really no depression in Hawaii. If we are a prosperous people here in Hawaii it shows that we are intelligent and capable of running these islands.

I believe that we are qualified to take and run Hawaii as one of the States of the Union, the Forty-ninth State of the Union. If any one of you before coming here has been against statehood, I hope as you have heard all the discussion, and have read about the hearings that were held in the different islands of the Territory, that you will change your views, and you know a good man always changes his mind.

Gentlemen, as you go back to Congress I hope you will recommend statehood, and I can say to you that the people, the majority of the people of the Hawaiian Islands are for statehood. I thank you.

Chairman LARCADE. Thank you very much.

(Mr. Fernandes is excused as a witness.)

Chairman LARCADE. Is there any witness here who desires to be heard before the committee to testify in opposition to statehood? [No response.]

Mr. YUTAKA HAMAMOTO. I would like to appear, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman LARCADE. Give your name and a short synopsis of your background.

Mr. YUTAKA HAMAMOTO. My name is Yutaka Hamamoto. I am now the agriculturist for the Hawaiian Canneries Co., and was born in the islands and went to schools here and I am a graduate of the University of Hawaii.

Mr. Chairman, I have not been asked by your statehood committee to present any brief here, but at the same time I said to myself that I will come here and present my views for statehood, because I am interested in statehood. It would be very unfortunate and it would be very unfair if any citizen of the United States of America, as Mr. Angell said a little while ago when you had the gathering at the Luau Gardens, to live in the greatest democracy of the world, and to live under that flag there, and for 80,000 students of the Territory of Hawaii who every day go to school and look at the flag and salute the flag, and to love that flag, and to look at the 48 stars, and leaving the Territory of Hawaii as a Territory for forty-odd years, when the United States of America has promised to the people of the Territory of Hawaii statehood, and has not been able to grant statehood for all these years, it is really a shame. We have been looking for statehood

for many, many years. Some of you have said: Are we ready for statehood? We have been ready for statehood for many, many years, and were ready many years ago.

Now I went to the University of Hawaii, and graduated from the University of Hawaii, and if you had to go to the University of Hawaii for forty-odd years before you graduated you don't blame the student, you would blame the professor, or the university. You are the professor of the university as you come from the Congress of the United States, and we have the greatest democracy in the world, and to kick these people around in the Territory when you have promised the people of Hawaii, of the Territory of Hawaii, that we will be granted statehood, when they were annexed to the United States of America, from when they were in a monarchy, then I would say the fault does not lie with the people of Hawaii, but with the Congress of the United States.

You are very, very busy, and some of the people have probably had statehood on their minds, but at the same time there were those who were not so minded, and who said: "We don't care for statehood; we are all right as a Territory of Hawaii"—but I don't believe so. We must work for statehood because we have 48 stars there, and when you go back to the United States Congress I hope that you will work for statehood, and vote for statehood.

The reason against statehood many years ago—the first reason, was that we were not economically sound. Then the people of Hawaii worked hard, working in the hot sun on the plantations, and in the wilds, and developed this place, and we became one of the richest spots in the world. That is an old story, and you Congressmen have been around and know the conditions here, and I am not going to go into those things. When we were ready economically then the reason given against statehood was that we were not ready politically. We have one of the finest legislatures anywhere that a man can find. To prove that, you can ask Senator Clem Gomes, and Mr. Marcallino, and many, many others, and ask Mr. Fernandes, who was a senator over on Oahu, in our great legislature, and if he says that we did not have a good legislature, then I will go back and sit there and will not be for statehood or speak for it.

Then the question came along, that while we were economically sound, and we were politically sound, but there was a big question mark as to the people of Hawaii, especially of my race, and I want to say that I am an American citizen of Japanese ancestry, and my father came here many, many years ago, not by his wish, probably, but he came here to become a laborer in the fields of the Territory of Hawaii, and one of those who brought this sugar plantation industry to its present position. I am proud of his kind, that worked here so hard, and for many, many years, and he has now passed away; he is no longer living on the island of Kauai. Sometime ago another man said: "You as a Japanese, you will never be able to obtain statehood in the Territory of Hawaii, because your loyalty is questioned," and that very man is not here today; his name was Mr. Donahiro, and he works for the Hawaiian Canneries Co. "The war will tell; the war will tell"—and again I don't have to come here and tell you what the American citizens of the Japanese ancestry has done in this war. This is a story. If I do say here that they have worked hard, that is the

same as if I am bragging to you, and I won't say a word. You are intelligent men and, when in the midst of a great democracy you know what they have done, therefore I believe that the question of loyalty of my kind of people, of my racial group, which I am proud of, you don't have to question them any more, but some other racial groups you may have to question. That you will study later on.

I am very much opposed to the ideas of Mrs. Campbell, the senator of the Territory of Hawaii. She has been criticising the Japanese groups and the Big Five, and when she herself, I believe, is economically wealthy, and her family owns almost as much, or is the second largest landowner in the Territory of Hawaii, and she obtains a great income from the Campbell estate which controls the Ewa plantation on Oahu.

I am married to the Hawaiian race, and my son is a part-Hawaiian, and we American citizens of Japanese ancestry have been criticized for years, questioning our loyalty and our conduct, and we believe that we can receive some more criticism yet; we believe that we will never forget that star, that extra star, and will continue to work for statehood.

Chairman LARCADE. Thank you. You have made a very fine statement.

(Mr. Miyake is excused as a witness.)

Chairman LARCADE. Does anyone desire to testify for or against statehood? Does anyone wish to testify against statehood at this time? (No response.)

Is there anyone further who desires to speak in favor of statehood? (No response.)

Mr. West, I believe you have a petition to file.

Mr. HOWARD B. WEST. Yes. My name is Howard B. West, and I am president of the Chamber of Commerce of Kauai, and manager of the Motor Supply Co. on this island.

This statement comes from the Kauai Junior Chamber of Commerce, and it was handed to me, as president of the senior chamber of commerce, to be presented to this committee. Mr. Chairman, may I present it at this time.

Chairman LARCADE. Without objection, it will be received for the record.

(The statement presented by Mr. West reads as follows:)

KAUAI JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,

Lihue, Kauai, T. H., January 18, 1946.

THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Subcommittee on Statehood for Hawaii.

HONORABLE SIR: The Kauai Junior Chamber of Commerce representing the young businessmen of the Garden Island at this time go on record as advocating that Hawaii be granted the privilege of becoming an integral part of the United States of America in the capacity of a State.

Admittedly, there are disadvantages in statehood over our present status, but when weighed against the advantages, the logical and most democratic step of statehood is unquestionably indicated.

Briefly, the points against statehood as some members of the Hawaiian scene have pointed them out are—

1. The racial majorities as they stand at present;
2. Dominating interests control; and
3. The fact that Federal funds given to the Territory might be lessened under statehood status.

However, on balancing these debit factors even if well founded (which is debatable), the following credits are—

1. Hawaii, paying more taxes to Uncle Sam than many States in the Union, will get full representation even though so far removed from the governmental center of the country. At present, Hawaii's national voice cannot be honestly classified as even a whisper.

2. Bloc voting cannot be used as a real argument against the statehood possibility, as the Nation has been bloc voting for years in a two-party scheme. Furthermore, the influx of permanent residents from the mainland will in the course of a very few years establish the balance in political and numerical power in the situation, which so many islanders are concerned over.

It might be pointed out that in 1912 New Mexico was admitted to the Union with a population of over 65 percent Mexicans, some of American citizenship, others not. The State has been well administered to the complete satisfaction of both the Mexicans and non-Mexican population as well as in harmony with the national picture from that time to this.

3. The hue and cry of large interests controlling the political picture here is greatly played upon. Hawaii is in no different position in this respect than other sections in the country and not all large concerns or their heads are nonaltruistic in their obligation to the community in which they stand.

4. Under statehood, the military groups will have much less authority over the local scene than under Territorial status.

5. In spite of the cries of racial dissension bloc voting, discrimination, and so forth, Hawaii has gone forward further in the quest for true understanding between the different peoples of the earth than probably any other place on earth. She can be a standard bearer in this respect, which might be a welcome guide for many sections of the mainland United States.

6. In regard to the effect that the Japanese population, particularly the alien element, might have on the statehood conditions, another point might be brought out. The younger generations of Japanese Americans are passing from the "old school" influence of the first generation's parents, who themselves came from the old country (Japan). Not only has schooling and environment had a great bearing on the second and third generations, but the war has had a tremendous influence in this direction. Trips back to Japan has been eliminated for 4 years. There is nothing for anyone to go back to Japan for now. There is nothing of the romantic appeal left, and both transportation and food difficulties will act as a further deterrent. With the goodly number of A. J. A.'s having spent time and traveling through the mainland, the interest of the A. J. A. servicemen, their families and friends in turning to the mainland—to the "new order of the Occident"—as opposed to the feudal system of the Orient. Hawaii as a State would draw these folks as well as the rest of us closed to the United States of America.

7. Right now is the time, if ever, for the bid for statehood to be made. The place that Hawaii occupied in the prosecution of the Pacific war, the fact that the war began for American right here, and the geographical position that she will continue to hold as a Pacific cross road and frontier for the mainland United States all point the way.

Open the door and let us come in where we belong. We don't want to be step-children, we've proven ourselves. Just look at the war bond records for that proof. We want to be a full-fledged member of the greatest and most democratic family on earth—the United States of America.

Yours for a Hawaiian forty-ninth State,

KAUAI JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
By A. H. EZELL, *President*.

Mr. SHIZUO TSUCHIYA. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a statement.

Chairman LARCADE. Very well. Give your name and state your business.

Mr. TSUCHIYA. My name is Shizuo Tsuchiya, and I am a school teacher, and have been for 18 years now, in the public schools. I was born and raised here.

Representative ANGELL. What is your ancestral background, please.

MR. TSUCHIYA. My father and mother were both Japanese. I was born here, and am a citizen of the Territory of Hawaii, of the United States. I am not going to bring out a lot of facts and report on things that have been already said here. I am just going to make what I think will be almost the final plea for statehood.

In 1898 Hawaii became a substitute on a great team. Since then she has seen many other substitutes earn a rookie's berth on that team, and today that team consists of 48 stalwart, all-American States. During that time Hawaii has grown and she has ironed out many of her faults. She has also worked hard to carry out her assignments. She has been called upon many times to carry that ball, and has not failed to cross that goal or to kick that extra point. Hawaii was a contributing factor in this team's overwhelming victory in the game just completed. I think Hawaii has shown that she is all American, and that she has earned the right to become a regular of the greatest team today—the United States of America. And, gentlemen, we ask that Hawaii be given team jersey No. 49. Thank you.

Chairman LARCADE. Thank you very much. Are there any more witnesses who desire to appear before the committee? (No response.)

Everyone has been given an opportunity to appear before the committee, and we will now close the meeting, but before closing I will now repeat, that any person or organization that so desires may file a statement or a brief before the committee leaves the Territory.

At this time, gentlemen of the committee, I desire to introduce in the record, and have copied, an editorial appearing in the Honolulu Star-Bulletin on Thursday, January 17, 1946, with respect to statehood, headed "Seeking Statehood Facts."

(Honolulu Star-Bulletin editorial, from p. 6 of the edition of Thursday, January 17, 1946, reads as follows:)

SEEKING STATEHOOD FACTS

No one could attend the public hearings on statehood held here for the past week without being profoundly impressed with the attitude of the congressional committee.

It is an earnest, conscientious, industrious, competent group of Congressmen.

Within the necessary limitations of time (and time was always an element, with many witnesses to be heard) it has gone deep into the statehood question, dug hard for facts as well as for opinions.

It has listened with patience—yes, tolerance—to witnesses who wandered far from the issue and could not be held to it.

Its members have not hesitated to ask probing, even sharp, questions on any matter germane to the subject and of any witness.

It announced at the opening its policy as one of desire to let everyone speak who wants to speak, and everyone file a statement who wants to file a statement.

By its friendly attitude toward the people of Hawaii as well as its conscientious attitude toward its duties as an investigating committee, it has convinced those who attended the hearings that it takes very seriously the urgent appeal of Hawaii for statehood.

Moreover, it has repeatedly emphasized that to present this appeal properly and effectively before the full House committee, and before Congress, it must have all the information possible, all the pros and cons, all the arguments for and all the arguments against admission of Hawaii as a State.

With the last of the Honolulu hearings today, it cannot be said that anyone has been denied the opportunity to speak.

It has been a public forum, and a good one. The standard set by Chairman Henry D. Larcade, Jr., of Louisiana, and his colleagues in the conduct of a public hearing has earned and will hold the respect of Hawaii, as the Congressmen individually have won the esteem and aloha of the islands.

Chairman LARCADE. I also desire to have appear in the record, for the committee, the address by Delegate Farrington at the annual meeting of the chamber of commerce at Honolulu, on January 17, 1946.

(A transcript of the address by Delegate Farrington at annual meeting of chamber of commerce, at Honolulu, is inserted in this record at the close of the January 17 transcript of proceedings.)

Chairman LARCADE. In closing, ladies and gentlemen, on behalf of the committee I desire to thank the officials and citizens generally of Lihue and the island of Kauai for the very fine reception that they have accorded to this committee, and I want to assure you that we appreciate greatly this very fine reception which has been extended to this committee on the occasion of this visit.

We will now adjourn.

(Meeting adjourned at 3:40 p. m., January 18, 1946.)

(Following the close of the hearings there were received from Chauncey B. Wightman, secretary of the Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association, the following: Exhibit No. 93: Home Ownership of Sugar Plantation Workers; exhibit No. 94: Annual Earnings of Sugar Plantation Workers.)

APPENDIX

REPORT OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON TERRITORIES, THE UNITED STATES ON TERRITORIES, THE UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, ON STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII

The Honorable HUGH PETERSON,
Chairman of Committee on Territories,
Washington, D. C.:

The first congressional committee to hold hearings on the question of admitting Hawaii to statehood visited the Territory in October 1935. After extensive hearings the committee "found the Territory of Hawaii to be a modern unit of the American Commonwealth, with a political, social, and economic structure of the highest type. Its educational program is an advanced one, with a large proportion of the tax dollar being spent for the training of its youth. Even during the period of the depression this program was neither relaxed nor reduced, and its school facilities compare favorably with those of the most advanced States. Hawaii's economic standards are high, with an industrial and agricultural development forming a sound basis for the continued growth of the Territory." Nevertheless, the committee concluded that considerable further study was necessary before a favorable report might be made on a proposal to admit Hawaii as a State.

In October 1937, pursuant to a concurrent resolution of the Senate and House of Representatives, a joint congressional committee visited the Territory of Hawaii. The committee reported that while great progress had been made by the people of Hawaii, the question of statehood, because of disturbed international conditions, should again be deferred by the Congress until further study and consideration could be given. It was the committee's view also "that unmistakable evidence that a substantial majority desire statehood should precede affirmative action by Congress." A plebiscite to determine the wishes of the people was authorized by the Territorial legislature in 1939. Of those voting on the question at the general election of November 5, 1940, 67 percent favored statehood and 33 percent opposed it. A Gallup poll held on the mainland in 1941 revealed that opinion in the continental United States for and against statehood for Hawaii was in almost the same proportions as the Territorial view expressed in the plebiscite.

During the war years, Congress was not able to give renewed consideration to Hawaii's statehood ambition. But with the end of the war in sight, the duly elected representatives of the people of Hawaii in the Territorial house and senate adopted, by overwhelming vote in each house, resolutions that the Congress of the United States take immediate action on admitting Hawaii to statehood. Pursuant to this request and to House Resolution 236 of the House of Representatives, dated April 30, 1945, the chairman of the Committee on Territories appointed a subcommittee to visit Hawaii, to hold hearings, and to make recommendations on H. R. 3643, introduced by Delegate Farrington "to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States."

The subcommittee appointed by the chairman consists of Henry D. Larcade, Democrat, Louisiana, chairman; James J. Delaney, Democrat, New York; George P. Miller, Democrat, California; Homer D. Angell, Republican, Oregon; Dean P. Taylor, Republican, New York; and Joseph R. Farrington, Republican, Territory of Hawaii. Irwin W. Silverman, chief counsel of the Division of Territories and Island Possessions, Department of the Interior, was assigned by the Secretary of the Interior at the committee's request to serve as counsel of the committee.

On December 20, 1945, just prior to the committee's departure, the Secretary of the Interior, whose Department has jurisdiction over the Territories, issued a statement endorsing statehood for Hawaii.

The counsel of the committee, Mr. Silverman, arrived in Hawaii several days before the committee to make preparations for the hearings and to arrange for the scheduling of the large number of witnesses who had indicated their desire to appear before the committee. The committee arrived in Honolulu on Sunday, January 6, 1946. Hearings were held in the throne room, Iolani Palace, on Monday, January 7, and continued through Thursday, January 10. In order that residents of all the islands comprising the Territory might be given an opportunity to be heard, hearings were held on Maui on Friday, January 11; on Molokai on Saturday, January 12; at Kona on Sunday, January 13; and at Hilo on the island of Hawaii on Monday, January 14. The committee returned to Honolulu on Monday, January 14, and held hearings in Honolulu from Tuesday, January 15, including a night session, through Thursday, January 17. It held hearings at Kauai on Friday, January 18, and left for the mainland on the 19th.

Prior to and at the beginning of the hearings the committee stated that full opportunity would be given to every person who desired to appear before the committee to present his views on the question of statehood and upon any other matter relating to the welfare of the Territory. About 100 witnesses were heard and examined by the members of the committee. In addition, a large volume of memoranda, statements, and statistical materials on the social, political, and economic problems of the islands was prepared and submitted by the heads of Federal and Territorial agencies, as well as by experts representing industrial, trade, labor, and civic organizations. The committee gave special attention to population trends, land ownership, concentration of wealth, and labor conditions.

FINDINGS

On the basis of the detailed and voluminous record made before it, the committee finds:

1. That the population of the Territory of Hawaii in 1945 was 502,122, of which 10,938 or 2.2 percent of the total population were Americans of Hawaiian ancestry; 61,422 or 12.2 percent were part-Hawaiians; 9,090 or 1.8 percent were Puerto Ricans; 172,583 or 34.4 percent were Caucasians; 30,005 or 6 percent were Chinese; 163,300 or 32.5 percent were Japanese; 7,042 or 1.4 percent were Koreans; 46,464 or 9.3 percent were Filipinos; all others, 1,228 or 0.2 percent.

2. That the number of pure Hawaiians has declined from an estimated 300,000 persons in 1778 to 10,988 in 1945.

3. That the Caucasian population has increased steadily since 1878, when the percentage of the total population was only 5.09 percent.

4. That persons of Japanese ancestry in 1890 numbered 12,360 or 13.7 percent of the total population. By 1920 the percentage increased to 42.7 percent, but had declined to 37.9 percent in 1930 and continues declining, to date being only 32.5 percent, or 163,300 persons at present.

5. That since 1912 the proportion of inter-racial marriages has increased from 14.1 to 38.5 percent, the trend being accentuated by the recent war, during which over one-third of the children born had two or more racial strains.

6. That well over 85 percent of the present population was born in Hawaii or on the mainland.

7. That the war record of Hawaii is in every respect commendable. Hawaii had a full-scale organization for civilian defense and volunteer defense units sponsored by the Army, and participated in Red Cross, USO, blood bank, and similar activities, making liberal contributions to the war chest and oversubscribing its quota for war bonds. The Territory established a number of emergency agencies, such as a Bureau of Registration and Identification, Office of Food Control and Food Production, and a commercial rent control program.

8. That Hawaii did its part in contributing men to the armed forces. Selective Service did not apply to Hawaii during the first 2 years of the war, because of the Territory's crucial position and shortage of manpower. Since the application of the draft, Hawaii has met its full quota. Hawaii had two National Guard regiments which were called into the Federal service on October 15, 1940. In all, 33,000 of the citizens of Hawaii served in the armed forces. Americans of Japanese ancestry were rejected from March 1942 until February 1943 but made up for this as soon as they were accepted. Although Americans of Japanese ancestry constituted only 36 percent of the registrants under selective service, 52 percent of the total inductions from December 1940 to September 1945

came from this racial group, because of the large number of volunteers. Because of the Army policy of organizing and segregating units composed entirely of citizens of Japanese ancestry, it is possible to follow their activities and to see how they proved unwarranted the mistrust initially shown by the military commanders. Hawaii residents of Japanese ancestry constituted the entire original One Hundredth Infantry Battalion and by far the major part of the original Four Hundred and Forty-second Combat Team. The record of those units, made in major offensives in the European theater, includes 5 Presidential unit citations, 1 Meritorious Service plaque, 65 Distinguished Service Crosses, 290 Silver Stars, 782 Bronze Stars, 10 Croix de Guerre (French), 3 soldiers medals (Italian), 50 Army commendations, and 82 division commendations.

9. That, according to Robert L. Shivers, Federal Bureau of Investigation agent in charge at Honolulu, there was not one single act of sabotage or fifth-column activity committed in Hawaii before, during, or after the attack on Pearl Harbor. Hawaii's people of various racial ancestries can and do work together, and what goes on in the countries of their ancestors is of minor concern to them, compared to their interest in the United States. People of all racial ancestries cooperated in preparing for and prosecuting the war, and Hawaii, despite its polyracial composition, is essentially American in thought, purpose, and action.

10. That the people of the Territory of Hawaii are a law-abiding people. Its different racial groups live together with a minimum of friction and no racial clashes; life and property are as safe in Hawaii as in any section of the mainland.

11. Such evidence of bloc voting as exists indicates that the practice has not assumed, and is not likely to assume, serious proportions. Members of the Territorial legislature whose ancestry is Japanese constitute normally less than 20 percent of the total membership, although 32.5 percent of the total population of the islands is of Japanese descent.

12. That in 1944, 71,704 of 84,326 registrants, or 85.03 percent, voted in the general election. The percentage of registered voters of Hawaiian ancestry declined from 33.8 percent in 1932 to 24.7 percent in 1940; Caucasian voters declined from 38.2 percent in 1932 to 30.1 percent in 1940. The Japanese showed an increase from 17.6 to 31.1 percent. With few exceptions, the percentage of registrants voting in each general election ranged between 85 to 90 percent.

13. That of the Territory's 4,118,400 acres, 1,762,050 acres, or 42.78 percent, are in public ownership and 2,356,350 acres or 57.22 percent are privately owned. The largest single owner holds 8.87 percent of the total of privately owned lands and the 10 largest owners (including the largest owner) together hold 30.11 percent; the 50 largest owners (including the 10 largest owners) hold 39.55 percent, and all other owners hold 17.67 percent of all privately owned lands.

14. That the largest owner is the B. P. Bishop estate, holding approximately 370,000 acres. This is a charitable trust, founded by a Hawaiian princess for the support of the Kamehameha Schools, which are devoted to the education of Hawaiians and Part-Hawaiians, and the expenses of administering the trust are paid from trust funds.

15. That of the Territory's total 4,118,400 acres, 2,947,330 acres are devoted as follows: 1,045,085 acres are devoted to forest reserves; 164,205 acres to national parks, 84,040 acres to Army, Navy, or other public use (including territorial and county purposes but not including highways); 1,350,000 acres to pasturage; 220,000 acres to the growing of sugar cane; 63,000 acres to the growing of pineapples, and approximately 21,000 acres to the growing of other crops, including: 6,760 acres, truck farming; 4,000 acres, coffee; 2,090 acres, fruits; 2,067 acres, taro and field crops; 770 acres, macadamia nuts; and 5,438 acres for miscellaneous crops.

16. That in 1940 there were 2,094 farms of less than 5 acres, and 4,724 farms of less than 100 acres (including those less than 5 acres).

17. That in 1944 Hawaii produced 874,946 tons of sugar cane, the crop being valued at \$65,498,532.

18. That in 1940—the latest year for which complete figures are available—Hawaii produced 22,341,429 cases of pineapples valued at \$45,851,706.

19. That the coffee production of the islands in 1944 totaled 7,656,000 pounds, valued at \$1,091,000.

20. That the Territory has consistently paid into the United States Treasury a considerably larger amount than the Federal Government, exclusive of military expenditures, has spent upon the Territory; its 1945 contribution amounting to \$173,999,227.22.

21. That in 1944 and 1945 Hawaii exceeded several States in the total of its internal revenue collections.

22. That the finances of the Territory have been very well managed. At the end of the last biennium, on June 30, 1945, total budgetary resources of the Territory amounted to \$68,339,384, with total obligations and resources in the amount of \$57,873,691, leaving an unappropriated surplus of \$10,465,693. The bonded debt of the Territory as of December 31, 1945, was \$16,520,000, with \$7,151,344 in the sinking fund, leaving a net amount of \$9,368,656.

23. That during the calendar year 1945 the following tax revenues were produced from the following sources:

Real property	\$6, 568, 605. 43
Personal property	3, 697, 620. 65
Income, personal and corporation	3, 529, 447. 21
Public utility	1, 897, 497. 05
Liquid fuel	1, 932, 749. 57
Compensation and dividend	8, 819, 507. 92
Bank excise	50, 000. 00
Liquor	1, 908, 979. 50
Tobacco	422, 664. 86
Gross income and consumption	10, 460, 310. 25
Unemployment compensation	1, 888, 749. 18
Business excise, poll, public welfare (prior years)	96, 468. 83
Administered by tax commissioner	41, 272, 600. 45
Inheritance and estate	661, 274. 16
Insurance	451, 472. 58
Miscellaneous licenses	10, 252. 63
Administered by Territorial treasurer	1, 222, 999. 37
Total	42, 395, 499. 82

24. That there are 35 sugar companies operating in the Territory with a total capitalization of approximately \$175,000,000 and with stock held by approximately 16,000 persons. There are five corporations, known as the Big Five which act in the capacity of factors or agents for practically all of these plantations, and to some extent have substantial stockholdings in the plantation companies. The companies, with the number of plantations represented and the approximate percentage of sugar production for each group of plantations, are as follows:

	Number of plantations represented	Approximate percentage of total sugar production
American Factors, Ltd.	9	30.8
C. Brewer & Co., Ltd.	14	23.5
Alexander & Baldwin	4	20.8
Castle & Cooke, Ltd.	3	14.5
Theodore H. Davies, Ltd.	4	6.9
Total	34	96.5

The agency system is not used to such a predominant extent in the pineapple industry, although some of the "big five" are connected with that industry through stock ownership or other affiliation. The "big five" have other interests as well.

25. That the commerce of Hawaii with the continental United States exceeds that between the mainland and all but a few foreign countries. From 1935 to 1940, only five foreign countries—the United Kingdom, Canada, Japan, France, and Germany—bought more from the mainland than did Hawaii. In 1940 the value of the Territory's imports from the mainland totaled \$127,539,539, while the value of exports to the mainland was \$102,145,130.

26. That bank deposits have increased from \$4,662,131 in 1901 to \$493,295,940 in 1945, much of the increase being due to the presence of Army and Navy personnel.

27. That Hawaii's gross assessed value of real property is over \$500,000,000—higher than that of any State at the time of admission with the exception of Oklahoma.

28. That as of December 1945, 36,875 corporations, firms, or individuals were engaged in 54,412 different enterprises as employers or self-employers.

A. There were 12,918 persons or companies engaged in retailing, representing the following subdivisions:

Appliances, 66; auto-dealers, 42; auto supplies, 69; bakeries, 61; barrooms and saloons, 380; books and stationary, 34; building materials, 10; chemicals, 17; cold drinks, 206; confectionery, 205; curios and novelties, 293; department stores, 12; drugs, 151; dry goods, 222; electric supplies, 21; equipment, 43; fish dealers and fish markets, 532; food products, 481; fountain and lunchrooms, 444; fruit and vegetable, 713; furniture, 91; general merchandise, 1,135; groceries, 641; hardware, 61; household products, 15; jewelers, 185; liquor stores, 173; lumber, 10; meat dealers and meat markets, 333; mill supplies, 11; music stores and composers, 23; newspapers, 25; nurseries, 88; office equipment and supplies, 27; optical, 17; poultry, 636; radio and radio supplies, 67; restaurants, 952; service stations, 387; shoe stores, 68; toilet articles and cosmetics, 55; wearing apparel, 172.

B. There were 2,999 companies or persons engaged in wholesaling, including the following types of wholesaling:

Appliances, 14; auto dealers, 14; auto parts, 36; bakeries, 55; beverages, 11; block printing, 19; boatbuilding, 10; bottle dealers, 21; building materials, 7; coconuts, 9; confestioners, 23; curios and novelties, 137; drugs, 39; dry goods, 42; electrical appliances, 19; equipment, 16; feed, 9; fish dealers, 273; florists, 41; food products, 109; fruit and vegetable dealers, 280; furniture, 26; general merchandise, 264; groceries, 44; hardware, 12; household products, 5; jewelers, 70; junk dealers, 8; lauhala weaving, 166; leis, 19; lumber, 5; magazines, 7; meats, 56; music, 9; tobacco, 6; toilet articles and cosmetics, 11; toys, 10; wearing apparel, 32.

C. Eight thousands three hundred and fifty-eight companies or persons were engaged in producing raw products, including:

Dairies, 66; farming, 1,051; fishing, 350; flower growers, 214; hog raisers, 589; poultry producers, 811; sugar growers, 2,135; vegetables and fruits, 1,542.

D. One thousand four hundred and twenty-six persons or companies were engaged in manufacturing, including:

Alcoholic beverages, 12; bakery products, 86; block printing, 17; chemical and fertilizer, 30; clothing, 27; concrete, lime, and stone products, 11; confectionery, 20; curios and novelties, 88; foods, 137; footwear, 21; furniture, 35; jewelry, 16; mattresses and springs, 12; nonalcoholic beverages, 38; soap, 7; wood products, 37.

29. That out of a total of 170,000 employees (not including part-time work by school children under the schools' temporary program established to meet the manpower shortage) the sugar industry employs about 24,500 workers. Pineapple agricultural labor (not including the canneries) totals about 4,750; 11,300 are employed in manufacturing (excluding sugar); 10,700 in transportation, communication and other utility services; 23,000 in wholesale and retail trades; 13,500 in various service industries; 7,400 in diversified agriculture; 6,600 in construction and quarrying, and 3,000 in financial, insurance, and real-estate establishments; 59,500 are in Government service and 4,075 in domestic service.

30. That since 1937 the Territorial legislature passed a number of labor laws, creating the Department of Labor and Industrial Relations, and dealing with such matters as apprenticeship, child labor, vocational training, vocational rehabilitation, unemployment compensation, regulation of employment agencies, minimum wages and maximum hours, payment and collection of wages, workmen's compensation, and safety regulations.

31. That the Territory's Department of Labor is considered by the local representative of the Federal Labor Department as doing an able job, and the Territory's labor legislation as comparing very favorably with that of many progressive States and in some respects is in advance thereof. Hawaii's unemployment compensation law provides more liberal benefits than that of any State with the possible exception of New York.

32. That the average cash wage paid to sugar employees in 1945 is in excess of \$5 per day for unskilled labor not including the value of perquisites, which include housing, fuel, water, lights, and medical and hospital services. The cash wage paid in the pineapple industry is comparable. Wages paid industrial workers have advanced in Hawaii more than on the mainland during the period 1940-45 and Hawaii now is on a par with the mainland.

33. That a standard 8-hour day is in effect throughout the Territory.

34. That Hawaii is the only Territory or State with the exception of Wisconsin to pass a little Wagner Act, extending collective bargaining to agricultural labor.

35. That unionization of labor has made strides during the past 10 years both in industry and agriculture; nearly all major industries, including the sugar and pineapple industries, are now organized or organization is pending therein.

36. That there are 46 organizations in the Territory affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, 68 with the CIO, 2 independent unions, and 5 Government employees' organizations.

37. That in 1940 there were 7 strikes involving 502 workers with 33,217 man-days lost; in 1941 there were 16 strikes involving 2,530 workers resulting in 34,241 man-days lost; in 1942 there were 2 strikes involving 49 men resulting in 67 man-days lost; in 1943 there were 4 strikes involving 202 workers resulting in 716 man-days lost; in 1944 there was 1 labor dispute involving 6 men with 60 man-days lost; and in 1945, up to November, there had been 9 strikes involving 1,047 men with 8,876 man-days lost.

38. That at the last Territorial election a majority of those elected to both houses were endorsed by organized labor.

39. That illiteracy in the islands among native-born citizens is almost nonexistent, Hawaii has well-equipped schools throughout the Territory, most villages and hamlets being provided with proper educational facilities.

40. The standards of instruction, according to United States Chamber of Commerce, are the same as on the mainland and higher than those in many States. The average number of pupils enrolled per teacher is 27.9 in Hawaii as compared with 31.4 in the United States urban schools and 26.1 in rural areas. The average pay per teacher in Hawaii is \$2,014 annually as compared to \$2,013 in urban centers and \$1,018 in rural areas of the mainland.

41. That there is a public library on each of the principal islands. There are 82,435 registered card holders. Each island library owns a bookmobile serving rural schools and homes, and approximately \$620,000 is spent annually on library facilities.

42. That the University of Hawaii compares favorably with many State universities. For the year 1944-45 there were enrolled 1,463 regular students and 1,145 graduate students. The university had financial support in the amount of \$3,126,028 for the biennium 1943-45, of which territorial appropriations from general revenues provided 50.8 percent, university income 27.46 percent, and Federal grants 21.74 percent.

43. That the level of the Territory's spiritual life is in the best American tradition.

44. That in 1945 the board of health spent \$1,623,385 or a per capita cost of \$3.23 as compared with \$1.66 in 1937.

45. In 1943, Hawaii's death rates from 18 causes were below the national median. The rate was higher for syphilis, tuberculosis, and accidents, including automobile accidents. The mortality rate of infants under 1 year had declined from 87 per thousand in 1930 to 30 per thousand in 1945; the number of maternal deaths for 1,000 living births had declined from 7 in 1932 to 1.6 in 1945.

46. That the venereal disease infection rate per 1,000 in Hawaii declined from 175 in 1911 to 7.5 in 1945. On the mainland the rate has declined from 163 in 1911 to approximately 43 in 1945. In Hawaii the locally acquired rate was 1.4 in 1945.

47. That according to the social security board, Hawaii's public-assistance program is based on "liberal, progressive legislation." Hawaii has no maximum limitation of public assistance; and the Territory has thus placed itself in a position to make payments to needy individuals commensurate with need, and to give recognition to changes in living costs. Hawaii also has a medical- and dental-care program, and provides other forms of public assistance for which no Federal grants are given.

48. That in 1945 Hawaii ranked thirty-ninth in the average grant for old-age assistance, fifteenth in the average grant for aid to dependent children, thirty-fifth in average grant for aid to the blind, and fifteenth in the average grant for general assistance.

49. That the territorial legislature has enacted legislation comparable to that of many States. Hawaii has adopted 20 of the mainland's uniform laws. In addition to laws mentioned above, Hawaii has a civil-service law, a modern retirement system for all employees. In the field of public health the Territory has enacted a crippled-children's act, created a bureau of mental hygiene, passed a uniform narcotic-drugs act, and established compulsory vaccination for small-pox, typhoid, and other diseases. In addition to the existing public medical-care program, the legislature in 1945 provided for a study of health-insurance and hospital facilities. In 1935 the legislature created the Hawaii Housing Authority, passed the Federal Housing Act authorizing the acquisition by any Federal agency

of property suitable for housing projects, and an act entitled "Government Aid for Housing Projects" authorizing the Territory and its political subdivisions to aid in the planning, construction, and operation of housing projects.

CONCLUSIONS

On the basis of the record and in view of the foregoing, the subcommittee concludes:

1. That Hawaii with its population of over 500,000 has a larger population than any other State at the time of admission to the Union with the exception of Oklahoma.

2. That the heterogeneous peoples of the Territory live and work together amicably, democratically, and harmoniously.

3. That the mixed racial complexion of Hawaii existed at the time of annexation, was not regarded as an obstacle to annexation, and should not now be considered an obstacle to statehood.

4. That the percentage of persons of Japanese ancestry reached its peak in 1940 and has steadily declined since then due to prohibition of immigration, lower birth rate, and the increasing immigration of other peoples.

5. That the people of Hawaii have demonstrated beyond question their loyalty and patriotism to the Government of the United States.

6. That on the record of their behavior and their participation in the war, American citizens of Japanese ancestry can be little criticized.

7. Such evidence of bloc voting as exists among Americans of Japanese ancestry is not likely to assume serious proportions in our opinion because they, like all other peoples, are divided amongst themselves by differences, political, social, and economic.

8. That Hawaii has been a Territory for 46 years, during which the people of Hawaii have shown themselves fully capable of self-government.

9. That there is a concentration of land holdings in the hands of a few persons, companies, or estates, but efforts have been made to improve this situation. The 1943 legislature created a Land Laws Revision Commission, which recommended the creation of a public corporation for the acquisition, subdivision, and sale of lands for home sites. A bill of this character, known as the Hawaii Home Development Authority Act, was introduced in the last session. Although it failed of passage then, and no further steps have been taken, it may in the near future be enacted into law. It provided:

"The authority is directed to acquire by purchase or eminent domain, undeveloped lands suitable for residential purposes on the island of Oahu, where the acute shortage of home sites exists. Lands thus acquired are to be subdivided into residential lots and offered for sale to those of the public most in need of houses. The development projects contemplated by the act are self-sustaining in nature. The act calls for an initial loan to the authority to be repaid to the Territory as the authority secures funds from its bonds, the issuance of which is provided for by the act."

10. That the Big Five dominates a great portion of Hawaii's economy; but this economic dominance has not prevented the establishment of many varied businesses, and there are good prospects for small business in Hawaii. Further, the influence of the Big Five has not prevented the enactment of progressive legislation in the field of labor, education, health.

11. That in every community of similar size, business policies are formulated by a relatively small number of individuals who hold positions of responsibility. There is no occasion to believe that these positions are maintained through stock control either directly or by means of proxies in Hawaii to any greater extent than is the case on the mainland. The committee's investigations were in the main confined to statehood, but in all the evidence presented to it, nothing indicated the existence in business life of collusion or fraud or any agreement or combination in restraint of trade.

12. That labor has made great strides since 1937 and has contributed greatly to the Territory's progress in the field of social and economic legislation.

13. That there is a growing mutual respect and confidence between management and labor in industrial relations.

14. That the school system of Hawaii has been successful in instilling into people of many races and backgrounds the objectives and ideals of democracy, and has produced a literate population capable of discharging the duties of citizenship.

15. That modern inventions have annihilated distance. Honolulu today is closer to the American mainland in time than the cities of Boston and New York were to the Capital in the early days of the Nation. Hawaii is closer to the seat of the Government today than all but the immediately adjacent States were when Washington first became the Capital of the United States. With efficient and rapid communication by cable, radio, or telephone, and 12- to 18-hour service for mail or passenger planes to the mainland, Hawaii can no longer be characterized as isolated.

16. That a majority of the people of the Territory are in favor of immediate statehood. No organized group has appeared in opposition. If a plebiscite were again held on the statehood question in our opinion the people would vote for statehood in the same proportion as they did in 1940.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Therefore, since—

1. The people of the Territory of Hawaii have demonstrated beyond question not only their loyalty and patriotism but also their desire to assume the responsibility of statehood; and since

2. The policy of the United States Government is one of self-determination; that peoples be allowed to choose freely their form of political status; and since

3. Hawaii's strategic location in the Pacific plays so large a part in our country's international position in this area; and since

4. The Congress of the United States has through a series of acts and committee reports indicated to the people of the Territory that Hawaii would be admitted into the Union when qualified; and since

5. The Territory of Hawaii now meets the necessary requirements for statehood;

It is the recommendation of this subcommittee that the Committee on Territories give immediate consideration to legislation to admit Hawaii to statehood.

HENRY D. LARCADE, Jr.,
Democrat, Louisiana, Chairman.
JAMES J. DELANEY,
Democrat, New York.
GEORGE P. MILLER,
Democrat, California.
HOMER D. ANGELL,
Republican, Oregon.
DEAN P. TAYLOR,
Republican, New York.
JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON,
Republican, Territory of Hawaii.

STATEMENTS FILED

	Page
1. E. E. Black, Territorial director of civilian defense.....	551
2. Andrew W. Lind, professor of sociology, University of Hawaii.....	559
3. Nils P. Larsen, president, Honolulu County Medical Society.....	560
4. E. C. Auchter, president, Pineapple Research Institute of Hawaii.....	561
5. Chauncey B. Wightman, secretary, Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association.....	563
6. W. H. Loper, chairman, Hawaii Employment Relations Board.....	565
7. Chuck Mau, supervisor, city and county of Honolulu.....	566
8. Martin E. Alan, writer.....	568
9. Frank W. West, chairman, Hawaiian Homes Commission.....	573
10. V. B. Libbey, chairman, public utilities commission.....	575
11. Heaton L. Wrenn, president, Bar Association of Hawaii.....	576
12. Benjamin O. Wist, dean, Teachers' College, University of Hawaii.....	584
13. Owen E. Long, department of public instruction.....	586
14. John H. Wilson, director, department of public welfare.....	593
15. C. Nils Tavares, attorney general.....	594
16. Lt. Col. Farrant L. Turner.....	597
17. Robert L. Shivers, former special agent, FBI.....	599
18. Harold W. Boss, director, civil service.....	606
19. Daniel K. Ainoa, Hawaiian Homes Commission.....	607
20. H. P. Faye, president, chamber of commerce.....	608
21. Stanley C. Kennedy, president, Inter-Island Steam Navigation Co., and Hawaiian Airlines, Ltd.....	609
22. Randolph Sevier, for Matson Navigation Co.....	615
23. S. N. Castle.....	621
24. Sophie J. Cooke.....	622
25. Roy A. Vitousek, chairman, Central Republican Committee.....	622
26. Manase Makekau.....	624
27. L. Q. McComas, department of labor.....	625
28. Colin G. Lennox, board of agriculture and forestry.....	632
29. Colin G. Lennox, board of agriculture and forestry.....	633
30. Gregg M. Sinclair, president, University of Hawaii.....	633
31. C. Nils Tavares, attorney general.....	635
32. Harry A. Baldwin, manager, Maui Agricultural Co.....	638
33. Charles R. Hemenway, Hawaiian Trust Co.....	639
34. J. Garner Anthony, former attorney general.....	640
35. Lawrence M. Judd, former Governor.....	641

STATEMENT No. 1

(See p. 54)

STATEMENT OF E. E. BLACK, TERRITORIAL DIRECTOR OF CIVILIAN DEFENSE, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE TERRITORIES COMMITTEE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, ON THE STATEHOOD BILL: SUBJECT, CIVILIAN DEFENSE ACTIVITIES IN HAWAII PRIOR TO AND DURING THE WAR WITH JAPAN

I. PREWAR ACTIVITIES

Civilian authorities in Hawaii were warned by the local Army and Navy commanders as early as 1939 to be prepared for an attack on these islands in the event of war with Japan. These warnings were repeated in 1940 and 1941 as the United States prepared for war.

Black-out practices were conducted by the civil authorities of the city and county of Honolulu, in cooperation with the United States Army, covering the island of Oahu in the years 1939, 1940, and 1941. Black-out was a part of the regular nightly routine after December 7.

Provisional police were organized among the civilians at the request of the Army authorities in 1940 to guard communication facilities, water supplies, and the water-front area in order to relieve regular trained Army personnel for front line duty in case of invasion. Some 1,500 guards were trained and ready for action by April 1941.

The major disaster council was created in April 1941 by the mayor and board of supervisors of the city and county of Honolulu for the purpose of coordinating all the civilian resources of the island of Oahu for the relief and general welfare of the people in the event of a major disaster, and the sum of \$5,000 was appropriated to cover its expenses. Firms and individuals donated \$1,700 toward the work of the council. The provisional police became wardens under the new set-up.

Similar councils were set up on the islands of Kauai, Maui, Molokai, and Hawaii, following the example of Honolulu.

The emergency medical and ambulance committee of the Honolulu Medical Society, which had been training volunteers for several months with funds supplied by the Honolulu Chamber of Commerce and assistance by the Hawaii Chapter, American Red Cross, was made a part of the major disaster council in July 1941. The mayor and board of supervisors appropriated \$6,000, and the proceeds of a benefit game yielded \$5,000 toward the expenses of this committee. The mayor's emergency reserve fund provided \$50,000 for the purchase of medical supplies and \$10,000 for first aid and other equipment during the period January to September 1941. Two allotments of medical supplies were distributed to first-aid units in September and October 1941, and a third allotment was ready for distribution when the attack began on December 7.

Medical preparedness in Hawaii dates back to 1940, when the Honolulu County Medical Society appointed a committee "to prepare a place, program, and schedule for training units to take care of civilian casualties in the event of a disaster such as war, earthquake, or fire." Acting upon the advice of the Medical Corps, United States Army, the city of Honolulu was divided into 17 zones, centering on schools or other buildings suitable for aid stations. Each station was staffed with 2 physicians and a large number of nurses, nurses' aides, litter bearers, etc. As of November 30, 1941, 220 ambulances had been donated by public-spirited firms and 5,100 volunteers had been enrolled for this emergency service. Volunteer first-aid units were also established on the islands of Hawaii, Maui, and Kauai early in 1941.

The emergency medical service functioned efficiently following the attack on the morning of December 7, and remained on duty almost constantly for the next 4 days.

The blood plasma bank, which was established early in 1941 through the health committee of the Honolulu Chamber of Commerce under an appropriation of \$3,500 for personnel and equipment, reported in September 1941 a stock of 80 flasks of 250 cubic centimeters of blood plasma available in case of disaster. This stock was in demand immediately on the morning of the attack.

The evacuation committee operated for about 4 months prior to December 7 under the major disaster council. This volunteer group made a survey of homes in Honolulu to determine the number of evacuees that might be accommodated in case of necessity. This information proved to be of great value in providing for approximately 3,000 women and children evacuated from the vicinity of military objectives following the attack. School buildings were used for the immediate care of those persons, and teachers and cafeteria personnel of the department of public instruction took charge of furnishing food and a place to sleep. Evacuees were transferred to private homes as rapidly as possible.

Fire wardens, later designated as air-raid wardens, were organized in July 1941 for the city of Honolulu. The city was divided into zones, sections, and precincts following the voting subdivisions, and a program of recruiting 5,000 volunteers was undertaken. About 500 members had been enrolled prior to December 7, but on that day alone "volunteers poured in by the hundreds, and by nightfall every block in the city was covered by members on patrol duty." Regular watches were kept in every block for a week after the attack. No funds were provided for the work of the wardens until after the inception of the office of civilian defense.

Other committees were organized under the major disaster council to cover all phases of civilian life on the island of Oahu in relation to the possible emergency. Many of these did not become active until December 7. Notable among these committees were the rural district committees on the island of Oahu, the majority of which centered in the several plantation communities on the island, each forming a complete self-sustaining unit headed by the plantation manager, assisted by members of his plantation staff. Some of these districts, such as Ewa, Waipahu, and Aiea, saw a great deal of action on December 7. Other committees under the major disaster council were: The engineering committee; committee on public information; Japanese committee; art and library protection committee; transportation committee; communications committee; light, power, and fuel committee; personnel committee; water and water-supply committee; streets and highways committee; health and sanitation committee; gas, rescue, and demolition committee; air-raid warning committee; recreation and morale committee; mortuary committee; finance and supplies committee; official-pass-distribution committee.

M-day law.—It became apparent early in 1941 that the matter of civilian preparedness for war was too grave to be handled by the city and county major disaster council with the limited finances and governmental authority at its command.

The council therefore urged the Governor and the legislature to enact an M-day law at the regular session of 1941 to give the Governor executive authority to act in case of an emergency and to provide funds to carry out the plans necessary for civilian preparedness. The legislature failed to do this.

Early in September the council again petitioned the Governor to call a special session to enact an M-day law. This special session met in October 1941; and after an earnest appeal from civic leaders and the commanding general, Hawaiian Department, United States Army, enacted an M-day law which was the guide for the Territorial office of civilian defense, successor to the major disaster council, beginning December 7.

The special session allocated \$500,000 for immediate use and \$1,000,000 if an emergency occurred.

II. THE YEAR FOLLOWING DECEMBER 7, 1941

Japanese planes bombed the island of Oahu on the morning of December 7 at the following strategic points: Pearl Harbor, Wheeler Field, Hickam Field, Bel- lows Field, Kaneohe Naval Air Station. The civil Governor invoked the M-day law immediately and appointed a Territorial director of civilian defense, who proceeded to set up an organization on Oahu and the outlying islands, building on the nucleus of the existing disaster councils. At the same time, martial law was declared, and the commanding general of the United States Army in Hawaii became the military governor of Hawaii. All matters of civilian defense were subject to the approval of the latter.

The sum of \$2,800,000, appropriated out of Territorial funds pursuant to the M-day law, was devoted to the construction of evacuee camps, splinter-proof shelters, first aid stations, etc.

Financial assistance from Washington.—On January 12, 1942, the President of the United States, by letter to the Secretary of the Treasury, transferred to the Department of the Interior the sum of \$15,000,000 to be expended for meeting the war emergency in Hawaii. On February 1, 1942, the Territorial office of civilian defense was transferred to the Federal pay roll, and a representative of the Interior Department arrived in Honolulu shortly thereafter to advise the local civilian authorities on civilian defense matters.

Federal funds were applied to the maintenance of the office of military governor, public health services, certain public and private hospitals, county police, and fire departments as well as the services directly controlled by the office of civilian defense.

Administration.—During the first year after December 7, the office of civilian defense continued under the dual control of both the civil and military governors, with stronger emphasis from the latter in view of the tense military situation then existing. As of June 1942, the organization comprised 2,500 paid employees and 16,000 volunteers. The files of the volunteer placement bureau showed a total of 40,000 volunteers as having been registered. Most of the effort was expended on the island of Oahu, in view of its strategic importance and dense population. Each of the principal outlying islands, however, was organized to meet the possibility of an attack.

The functions undertaken by the office of civilian defense during this period were:

A division of press and public relations which handled press releases, radio programs, talks, and magazine articles dealing with civilian defense.

A civilian defense corps for Honolulu and the rural districts on the island of Oahu, divided into units covering the following activities: Bomb reconnaissance; plans and training; demolition, rescue, and repair; gas defense; Communications; Transportation; mortuary and burials; women's division; rural Oahu division.

Similar units were organized on the outlying islands.

An air-raid wardens' division carried over from the prewar major disaster council for the city of Honolulu embracing 6,000 trained volunteers. These wardens were organized to patrol the city, block by block. They investigated fire hazards; obtained information as to hose, pumps, and other fire-fighting equipment available to the individual householder; investigated black-out violations; and kept home owners informed on matters involving the protection of life and property. During alerts, they cleared the streets of persons unauthorized to be there and reported all incidents to civilian defense headquarters, where complete records were kept for the use of the military authorities. During the evacuation of downtown Honolulu, just before the battle of Midway, the air-raid wardens operated with smoothness and efficiency. Auxiliary fire-fighting equipment purchased with Lanham Act funds was manned by the wardens at vital points throughout the city and in many cases was used in fighting both house and brush fires. The wardens distributed evacuation information, carried out scrap-metal and rubber drives, made surveys of various kinds, assisted in the renumbering of houses in Honolulu, and helped in war loan drives. These men gave unsparingly of their time to take training and to carry out their responsibilities faithfully throughout the emergency.

The emergency medical service, which was Territory-wide, was operated under the office of civilian defense after December 1941. Its work on December 7 is worthy of the highest praise.

First-aid stations.—This division established 20 first-aid stations on the island of Oahu, augmented by 10 substations, which were operated by 365 paid personnel and 1,460 volunteers. Some 5,000 persons were trained in first aid, and more than 5,000 air-raid wardens and messengers were trained in special first-aid classes conducted by 9 doctors, who volunteered their services.

Ambulance service.—This service had on hand 52 ambulances, 33 of which were located on the island of Oahu; 250 volunteer ambulances were available in an emergency, and 400 volunteer drivers were qualified for service; 58 volunteer messengers were enrolled for service among the various medical units.

Emergency hospitals.—Existing hospital facilities in Honolulu were increased by an additional 1,000 beds. Sacred Hearts Convent was converted into a modern, fully equipped and staffed hospital of 500 beds, including a "blitz"

surgery. More than 300,000 dressings and other hospital supplies were stored at this hospital. An emergency hospital of 90 beds and a reserve supply of 88 cots was set up at Shriners Hospital, which was used as a polio hospital during the 1943 epidemic. An emergency unit of 115 beds was set up at the Manoa Japanese School. The Wahiawa Emergency Hospital in rural Oahu provided for 250 patients. Emergency hospitals were also established on all of the principal outlying islands.

Honolulu blood-plasma bank.—This bank, established in February 1941, was indispensable on December 7, having furnished 1,000 doses of blood plasma on that day alone. Storage facilities were made available in 19 places in hospitals, stores, and ice houses in the city of Honolulu and in 5 places in the rural districts on Oahu. The average cost of plasma produced was approximately \$10 per unit.

Nursing activities.—Nurses in the Territory were registered to the extent of 1,397, both active and inactive, up to June 30, 1942. Mainland nurses were recruited for service in the Territory with some success. The American Red Cross cooperated by giving courses for volunteer nurses' aides to supplement the regular nursing staffs of the hospitals.

Emergency feeding.—This division of civilian defense work on the island of Oahu was organized to feed both paid employees and volunteers. Two well-equipped cafeterias were operated in Honolulu, one at Iolani Palace and one at civilian defense headquarters at Kaahumanu School. Both cafeterias have been self-supporting. This service grew naturally out of the cafeteria service in the local public school system. It was prepared at all times on a mobile basis to feed evacuees and to serve the first-aid stations.

Emergency food storage.—Four basic types of canned food, meat, fish, fruit, and milk were stored in relatively safe areas in Honolulu and on rural Oahu. Use of stored food was limited to absolute emergencies. Four day's supply of food and emergency clothing were stored at all evacuation centers. Foodstuffs were inspected periodically and rotated as necessary to insure quality.

Protective construction.—This division was in charge of maintenance and repairs of all buildings used by the office of civilian defense. It constructed housing for electric generators, garages for ambulances, and police cars, as well as furniture of all kinds for the many offices established for the purpose of civilian defense.

Bomb shelters to care for 40,000 persons were constructed under contract. This method was followed also in the splinter-proofing of essential public utilities and public services.

Registration bureau.—The plan for the identification of civilians was prepared in July 1941. After December 1941, the entire population of the Territory was subject to registration. In order to carry out this work, the islands were divided into registration districts, using the taxation zones, plats, and parcels as a basis for census distribution. By June 30, 1944, 500,000 personal history records and 450,000 fingerprint cards were accumulated. The Army, Navy, and FBI have checked through approximately 300,000 of these records for the purpose of safeguarding internal security.

Civilian defense on outlying islands.—The island of Kauai is typical of the organization on all the outlying islands. This island had a substantial foundation for civilian defense through the organization created by the Kauai county government prior to December 7, 1941. This organization included first-aid units, air-raid wardens, volunteer fire fighters, auxiliary police and communication units. The island was divided into five districts, each district being a self-contained unit covering all phases of civilian protection. These districts were coordinated through a control center at Lihue, the principal town. Kauai took over both gasoline and food rationing in the early days of the war, finally surrendering this work to the O. P. A. when it reached the islands.

Three hospitals were built and equipped on sites approved by the local U. S. Army authority. A blood bank was also established.

Civilian defense organizations on the islands of Maui, Hawaii, and Molokai were successfully maintained throughout the emergency.

III. FROM NOVEMBER 1, 1942, TO THE END OF THE EMERGENCY

The date, November 1, 1942, marks a change in the directorship of the Office of Civilian Defense, resulting from a change in the governorship of the Territory. The big expenditures and commitments for the protection of the civilian

population had been made, the battle of Midway had been fought and won by our forces and the emergency no longer seemed as acute as it had in the early months of 1942. The problem faced by the new director was that of cutting the budget while at the same time taking all reasonable steps to improve the morale of the volunteer civilian defense units. An attitude of complacency had begun to develop even though the danger of a bombing or commando raids or submarine shelling was still great. The danger of local catastrophe was always present due to the movement of large quantities of explosives and ammunition by rail and truck through the city of Honolulu. Fire has been an ever present threat due to flimsy, frame construction in many congested areas of the city.

The first step was to streamline the civilian defense organization by reducing personnel and consolidating functions on the part of the paid staff and by bringing the volunteer units into closer cooperation. The second step was to promote intensive training courses, moving picture programs and competitions of various kinds for the purpose of sustaining interest on the part of the volunteer groups. The cooperation received from the commanding general and his staff in this second phase, through the assignment of Army officers as lecturers on the various phases of civilian defense and from both the Army and Navy in the matter of battle films and other high grade movies, was of inestimable value in holding the volunteer organization together.

Plans and training division.—The plans and training division came into existence following the attack in December, 1941, its purpose being to lay out training courses and programs for civilian defense volunteers. Contact was maintained through channels with the Office of Civilian Defense in Washington, D. C., in order to obtain all literature, display posters, and training material that might be helpful to the local effort. Army-conducted training courses were arranged and conducted with the cooperation of the Office of Civilian Component Affairs, U. S. Army. The navy yard authority at Pearl Harbor cooperated through the plans and training division to open its fire fighting course to civilian defense volunteers. Joint maneuvers with the U. S. Army were arranged from time to time for Honolulu and the island of Oahu, much to the advantage of the wardens and other members of the protective services.

Gas defense division.—This important unit was established March 6, 1942, by directive of the Territorial Director of Civilian Defense for the purpose of instructing the civilian population on the protective methods to be employed in meeting a possible poison gas attack. This division set up a gas alarm system in all populated areas, prescribed methods for individual and collective protection against war gases and for the decontamination of gas casualties and gassed areas. Its scope was territory wide. Over 400,000 regular U. S. Army training gas masks, obtained from the Chemical Warfare Service, U. S. Army, were distributed to the people of the Territory; 30,000 special masks were made by this unit for school children and 35,000 locally manufactured "Bunny Masks" were supplied for the protection of infants. This division carried on an intensive educational program in the schools and at other public gatherings. Both civilian instructors and officers attached to the U. S. Army Chemical Warfare Service conducted lectures, demonstrations, and drills in this connection. This division also planned and supervised the construction of 32 decontamination stations on the island of Oahu for cleansing persons exposed to war gasses and trained volunteers for this special work. Mobile squads for the same purpose were set up in various parts of Honolulu.

Bomb reconnaissance division.—This division was created by directive of the Territorial Director of Civilian Defense on June 1, 1942, to select, appoint, train and supervise civilian bomb reconnaissance agents and map plotters to enable them to deal with unexploded bombs. All members of this division were examined and passed by Military Intelligence before appointment, and all training was conducted by officers and noncommissioned personnel of the Bomb Disposal Company, U. S. Army, who maintained close contact with this group throughout the continuance of this work. The cooperation shown by the Army in this regard was excellent.

Communications division.—Although the principal operating functions of this division were of necessity absorbed by the wardens division to preserve unified control, it should be mentioned here that much credit is due the Boy Scouts organization for their efficient service whenever called upon. Communications were maintained primarily by telephone and, to some extent, by radio, but in the last analysis it was always the messenger augmented by bicycle or motorcycle who got through.

Womens division.—One of the most successful groups engaged in civilian defense was the women's division, the name of which was later changed to the Civilian War Services Division. This unit was established in May 1942, and was limited in scope to the city of Honolulu. Its functions were to disseminate defense information to women and children in the homes, to develop a central information bureau to answer questions for the Office of Civilian Defense and to organize "neighborhood groups" in order that home protection techniques might be successfully implanted in the homes. Each home in a "neighborhood group" was expected to deal successfully with such things as war gas, incendiary bombs, fire protection and first aid. The women's division sponsored the junior civilian defense organization in the schools, sent regular bulletins to children throughout the Territory and gave summer training courses in Honolulu in order to teach the youth of Hawaii to be prepared to meet the war time emergency. So successful were the women of this division in their work among the different neighborhood groups that their paid staff has been taken over by the Honolulu Council of Social Agencies and is now being financed by the community chest as one of its permanent activities.

Restoration of civil rights.—The powers assumed by the military governor in December, 1941, were restored to the civil Governor on March 10, 1943. At this time certain functions exercised by the military governor, although financed with O. C. D. funds, were placed under the administration of the director of civilian defense. One of these functions was exercised by the division of materials and supplies control.

Division of materials and supplies control.—This division had been organized in February 1942, as a direct result of the war. Its purpose was to formulate a practical system for controlling the importation of all commodities, other than food and feed, and to establish a practical system whereby local merchants, industries, and public utilities would be assured of securing War Production Board releases of essential critical materials. A suboffice was established in San Francisco for the purpose of booking cargo in accordance with ratings assigned by the Honolulu office. The system developed by this office to achieve its purpose proved to be practical and efficient. Another function restored to the civil Governor was the division of food production.

The office of food production engaged in a wide variety of activities all of which were aimed at increasing local food production and effectuating equitable distribution of available supplies.

The interest of this office in land tenure resulted, through the cooperation of volunteer business leaders and the military, in well over 50 diversified farmers (at one time scheduled for removal from their land) being able to continue and even increase their production.

To augment the private production of fresh vegetables, two farms which were originally inaugurated and operated by the office of the military governor, were continued by the office of food production. Between August 1942, and January 1944, these farms produced 1,966,000 pounds of fresh produce valued at over \$125,000. During the entire war period over 3,300,000 pounds were produced.

Territorial-wide production of fresh vegetables, in spite of an extreme drought in some major producing districts, increased nearly 10 percent in 1943 over that of 1942.

Swine production was increased largely through making military installations garbage available to producers. Swine slaughtering was centralized on Oahu and pork supplies were prorated to dealers to assure equitable distribution. Over 6,000,000 pounds of pork were produced during 1943.

Fresh fruit and vegetable distribution was channeled through the farm produce coordinators, a department of the office of food production. A logistics committee, composed of a naval supply officer, an Army supply officer, and a representative of the office of food production, coordinated distribution. Hospitals and returning submariners held top priority. The civilians and other military organizations shared the balance of supplies and the military absorbed any temporary surpluses. Between June and December 1943, the farm produce coordinator handled over 4,000,000 pounds of produce.

Seed was imported and distributed by the office of food production during the critical supply and shipping period.

Poultry and dairy production received attention, the aim being to correlate production with available imported protein feedstuffs or shipping space. Field corn production was encouraged on Molokai and Hawaii.

Continuous efforts under severe handicaps were made to increase fish production. Transportation difficulties were largely overcome, permitting regular arrivals from important producing districts on the off islands.

With the assistance of the office of food control, imports were correlated with local production, thus assuring the availability of necessary supplies while conserving vital ship space.

The activities of the office of food production were extremely varied but always guided by the policy of producing all possible on an economical basis, fairly distributing all production, and conserving ship space.

Food control was an organization headed by a director and staff who worked with committees of local wholesalers. They decided how much and what commodities should be brought in from the mainland by the cargo space allotted for civilian needs. This control working together with F. S. C. C. kept the Territory well fed and supplied with the necessities of life.

As consolidation progressed, this department took over the duties of materials and supplies division. Permits were issued for importing and cargo space assigned for all materials and supplies deemed necessary to the Territory's economy. This required sound judgment, and an excellent job was accomplished, as the Territory needed 35,000 tons of feed, 50,000 tons of materials and supplies each month, and several months less than 30,000 tons of shipping were available.

Medical Supplies and poison control was formerly under the military governor, having been established on December 14, 1941, by general order. This agency checked and recorded all poison stocks throughout the Territory, controlled the poison stocks of alien firms, required firms dealing in poisons to obtain a "dealer's permit", and placed a limit on purchases. On June 1, 1944, the medical supply department of the Office of Civilian Defense was consolidated with poisons control. This latter department was created on March 9, 1942, for the purpose of procuring and distributing medical supplies and materials to the installations of the emergency medical service and its affiliated agencies in the Territory. In the final year of civilian defense operations, this consolidated office also arranged motion picture schedules, procured films and attended to the repair of motion picture equipment.

Expansion of existing protective services.—No statement describing civilian defense during the war is complete that does not include reference to the expansion of the normal community protective services, particularly the police and fire departments on the several islands and in Honolulu.

The emergency police reserve was organized in July 1941, under the Honolulu Police Department as a measure of preparedness in the event of war. The original force, commissioned December 1, 1941, comprised 150 men between the ages of 30 and 45 who served without pay. During the war, the total number of police reserves reached a figure of almost 300. These men came from all walks of life, including legislators, professional men, and business executives. They served under an assistant chief of police, a retired British Army officer, who devoted full time to this work without pay. Training was both theoretical and practical in such matters as police and court procedure, accident investigation, preservation of evidence, first aid, self defense, use of gas, firearms and fundamentals of criminal law. While in training these reserves devoted one night each week to classroom instruction and one night to patrolling a beat in company with a regular police officer. The Honolulu Police Department could not have met its responsibilities on December 7 without the help of these reserves. For 16 days following the attack they were on duty for 8 to 10 hours each day. Throughout the emergency and until long after VJ-day these volunteers reported for duty 1 day in every 6, 40 of them, 2 to a car, serving each day on the 3 to 11 o'clock p. m. shift. Their only compensation was \$10 per month to pay for public liability and property damage insurance premiums on their private patrol cars. The city of Honolulu is much indebted to these men for their unselfish service in the emergency.

The expansion of the police service on the outlying islands was based on pay-roll assistance to the counties by the Office of Civil Defense. Additional equipment for use by the police, including revolvers, radios, and other equipment was also furnished out of civilian defense funds.

Fire department.—The expansion of the fire department in the city of Honolulu to meet the threat of an incendiary raid was accomplished by means of both standard fire truck and trailer-pumper units purchased with Lanham Act funds. New fire stations were established at various points throughout the city. These were equipped with new standard apparatus and manned with

regular employees paid out of OCD funds. Some 50 small, volunteer units, equipped with trailer-pumpers, hauled by 1½-ton trucks furnished by the local Army Command and manned by Fire Wardens were prepared for any emergency and many of them performed admirably in fighting actual fires. The volunteer firemen were well trained by a regular, experienced staff from the Honolulu Fire Department. Competitions between units and between the four, major, city zones into which the volunteer force was divided, kept these small units in a high state of efficiency. The Honolulu Fire Department deserves much credit for helping to maintain the morale of these volunteer units and for its cooperation in the over-all planning to coordinate all the fire fighting forces of the city.

Personnel and equipment for the expansion of the fire departments on the outlying islands were made available through funds supplied by the Office of Civilian Defense and the Lanham Act.

Financial summary.—The following is a summary of the Federal funds expended by the Office of Civilian Defense as of December 29, 1945:

Original allotment:	
Dec. 24, 1941	\$2, 800, 000
Jan. 12, 1942	15, 000, 000
Total appropriation	17, 800, 000

Expenditures:	
1942 fiscal year	2, 925, 005
1943 fiscal year	9, 575, 084
1944 fiscal year	2, 842, 928
1945 fiscal year	794, 177
1946 fiscal year (estimated)	271, 663
Total expenditures	16, 408, 857

Estimated unexpended balance	1, 391, 143
------------------------------	-------------

Outstanding obligations at this time, which are included in the estimate of expenditures for 1946 stated above, are as follows:

Pay rolls, December and terminal leave	\$8, 000
Travel of nurses (estimated)	4, 000
Miscellaneous current expense	4, 000
Total obligations	16, 000

During the operation of the Office of Civilian Defense, we have received and deposited into the Treasury of the United States \$764,711.96 from the following sources:

Registration division	\$96, 097. 50
Sale of property to other Government agencies	49, 404. 03
Sale of surplus property	224, 761. 10
Hospital and medical services	225, 463. 07
Sale of surplus buildings	64, 176. 62
Rental of buildings	104, 809. 64

An audit of Territorial funds is now in progress by the Territorial Auditor's Office and this report will cover the status of M-day funds allotted this office. A preliminary audit was made by the auditor on November 20, 1945, and at that time the accounts were in agreement. All revolving funds operated through this office were closed on November 30, 1945, with no outstanding obligations pending. Balances in these accounts will be transferred to the general fund of the Territory by the auditor.

Conclusion.—As a result of my experience as Director of the Office of Civilian Defense since November 1, 1942, it has been my observation that, given an impelling motive, such as the recent war emergency, there is ample assurance of strong community cooperation. This is true with respect to all racial elements in our population.

Respectfully submitted.

E. E. BACK,
Territorial Director,
Office of Civilian Defense.

STATEMENT No. 2

(See p. 57)

POPULATION TRENDS IN HAWAII

(Statement of Andrew W. Lind)

Hawaii's population has increased nearly four times during the past 50 years, from about 100,000 to approximately 500,000. This phenomenal growth is chiefly a consequence of the improved economic opportunities afforded by the Territory and can largely be traced in the statistics of immigration. During the first three decades of the present century, Hawaii's growth in population was overwhelmingly through the influx of plantation laborers and their dependents. It is estimated that 200,000 persons migrated to Hawaii between 1900 and 1932. Since 1940 there has been another period of extensive movement during which Hawaii's population has been increased by 60,000 through migration alone.

The racial complexity likewise of Hawaii's population has been greatly increased by immigration during the past 50 years. Three contrasted population elements, the Koreans, Puerto Ricans, and Filipinos, have been added to the complicated racial pattern which already existed here; and important additions to the immigrant Japanese and Portuguese also occurred during this period. By 1920, Hawaii's racial complexity had probably reached its peak with 11 major ethnic or "racial" groups in the population, Hawaiian, Part-Hawaiian, Portuguese, Spanish, Puerto Rican, Haole or Other Caucasian, Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Filipino, and Negro. In 1920, 57 percent of the entire population of the Islands had been born outside Hawaii or Continental United States.

The population movements since 1920 have been chiefly in the direction of greater integration and interracial solidarity. By 1940, for example, almost four-fifths (78.7 percent) of the population were natives of Hawaii or of continental United States; and by 1945 this ratio had increased to well over 85 percent. Similarly the tendency for the various ethnic groups to intermarry and thus fuse the population into a single American-Hawaiian type had proceeded to such a degree that by 1940 it was necessary for the Census Bureau to combine the Portuguese, Spanish, and Haoles into a single Caucasian group; and it is becoming increasingly difficult to differentiate accurately between the Hawaiians and Part-Hawaiians.

Hawaii has long been noted for its intermingling of races and the experience of the past 50 years adequately confirms this impression. Definite statistics for the early period are unavailable, but since 1912 the proportion of marriages between persons of different racial ancestries has increased from 14.1 percent to 38.5 percent. The war has greatly accentuated the trend toward interracial marriage, but even before the war approximately 3 out of every 10 marriages in the Territory were across the conventional racial lines. Each of the various racial groups has participated in the process, some, however, to a greater degree than others. Among the immigrant peoples, it is usually those least adequately supplied with women which intermarry most readily. Thus the Chinese, Filipinos, and most recently the Caucasian men have more commonly looked to other groups for their wives than is true in the Japanese group, for example. The native Hawaiians have always been noted for their cordial reception of the visitors to Hawaii; and this has extended to marriages, as well. During the 30-year period, for which statistics are available, the average out-marriage rates for both Hawaiian and Part-Hawaiian has been over 50 percent. Similarly the smaller groups such as the Spanish, Koreans, and Puerto Ricans tend to have high intermarriage rates. The effect of increasing interracial marriage is reflected in the number of children of mixed racial ancestry born in the Territory. During the war years, the ancestry of slightly over one-third of the babies born could be traced to two or more racial strains.

Visitors to Hawaii frequently express concern regarding the possibility that a single immigrant group may take possession of Hawaii's population by virtue of its capacity to reproduce. Actually, each of the immigrant groups during the early days of its residence in the Territory tends to have a high birth rate which slowly declines as the group becomes assimilated into island life. During the 1890's and 1900's, it was the Chinese and Portuguese immigrants which had the largest families. In the following period, the more recently arrived Japanese

had the highest reproductive rates. Since 1930 it has been the Filipinos and Puerto Ricans who have ranked highest in reproduction. It must be noted in this connection that crude birth rates, computed upon the total population of a group, may be quite misleading, particularly with a group made up largely of single men. Thus the Filipinos show one of the lowest crude birth rates, although, when figured on the basis of the number of women between the ages of 20 and 45, their rate is the highest of all the ethnic groups. The corrected birth rates for all of the racial groups had been declining during the thirties; but the war, here as elsewhere, has resulted in a temporary boom in the number of babies.

There has been a gradual shift in the complexion of the babies born in Hawaii during the past 25 years. In the early twenties, almost 70 percent of the children born were of Asiatic ancestry, with the Japanese alone constituting 48 percent of the total. Just prior to World War II, the Asiatic births had declined to 53 percent, with the Japanese ratio at 34.8 percent. In the postwar period, we may anticipate a further decline in the ratio of Asiatic births to less than 50.

Examination of Hawaii's record of population and vital statistics during the past 25 years reveals a steady trend toward a citizen population of numerous racial antecedents, but unified through their common experience within an American community.

STATEMENT No. 3

(See p. 72)

STATEMENT OF HONOLULU COUNTY MEDICAL SOCIETY

(By Dr. Nils P. Larsen)

To the STATEHOOD COMMISSION.

DEAR SIRs: The Honolulu County Medical Society would like to place on record some ideas regarding statehood for Hawaii from the point of view of the physician.

Since the United States is organized on the principles of justice and fair representation, and since its original organization of a Territory is on the assumption that this is a preliminary stage to statehood, then when such a Territory has attained in performance a record that would entitle it to take a seat in the national representative halls, it would then seem fair to believe it has earned its right to assume its full responsibilities as a State. The fact that Hawaii pays more taxes to the National Treasury than 14 States, the fact that it imports yearly \$167,000,000 worth of goods from continental United States, the fact that its 45 years of tentative lawmaking have led to no major scandals and that the Territorial budget has remained sound, are of no direct concern to us as physicians, although they would seem important from other angles.

In the accomplishments from a health angle, we feel the health records of Hawaii stand out as strikingly good. Last year among the group of rural laborers whose health has been carefully analyzed for the past 12 years, there was an infant mortality of only 18 per thousand live births, as well as a total of only 30.3 for the Territory, whereas the best State record was 29.6 and one of the States had a rate of 90. The maternal mortality record in the rural areas mentioned was only five-tenths per thousand—a real record of maternal protection. These two figures are the most commonly used indexes of excellent medical protection in any community. Hawaii rates well. In tuberculosis we have seen a more rapid decline of new cases and deaths than has any State. When we compare present figures with the records from the Orient, where many of our people came from, then we show a shining example of what well-organized health activities can accomplish.

In the field of industrial health, favorable comments have come from various leaders in industrial medicine throughout the mainland. The venereal rate was so low and the resultant protection to the men of our fleet was so much better than the record in the Atlantic area that the admiral wrote a special letter of commendation after the first year's stay on the fleet in our waters.

The doctors and lay people have organized a health-insurance system, which has been studied by many of the States. It is a real health cooperative. Most of the hospitals have received accreditation from the American College of Surgeons as having met the minimum standards of the best hospitals in America. The doctors and nurses have erected the Mabel Smyth Memorial Building, which

is a monument that has been praised by all visiting doctors and nurses. It has been a meeting center for all professional groups. The academy of arts expresses a cultural background and interest that would be a credit to any community. The agricultural experiment station has done outstanding work in improving agriculture and is recognized the world over. The university rates well in educational circles. The school system, being centrally controlled, gives equal schooling opportunities to every child in Hawaii, even in its remotest districts, and has taught Americanization in a way that few other school systems have done. It is well ahead of the systems now in vogue in many of the States. The record made by the One Hundredth Battalion and the Four Hundred and Forty-second Combat Team show that this Americanization was not mere mouthing patriotism but actually expressed itself in a willingness to sacrifice all to maintain this spirit of America, of which they learned in our schools. Our industrial leadership, reflecting some of the idealism of the early missionaries, has shown a concern for its laborers as well as a willingness to participate in community activities in a way that would be a credit in any American community. The yearly community chest drive indicates that there is an interest in total welfare. This is expressed in the 26 agencies which are supported by this drive and which try to see to it that no man, woman, or child shall suffer from neglect, in spite of mental or financial handicaps.

The racial harmony of the islands is well expressed by the Honolulu County Medical Society, which has among its leadership men of various racial extractions and in its active membership of 250 here at 67 doctors of Japanese background, 41 of Chinese, 5 of Korean, 1 of Hawaiian, and 137 of European background. This spirit of cooperation is an actuality and not gossip.

All these actual accomplishments we, as physicians, feel should entitle Hawaii to its rightful place along with the other component sister parts of the Republic. Its representatives should have the full right to sit with those other members and discuss the problems concerning the total welfare of the United States. We believe Hawaii has earned this right.

STATEMENT No. 4

STATEMENT BY DR. E. C. AUCHTER, VICE PRESIDENT OF THE PINEAPPLE GROWERS ASSOCIATION OF HAWAII AND PRESIDENT OF THE PINEAPPLE RESEARCH INSTITUTE OF HAWAII

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is E. C. Auchter and I am vice president of the Pineapple Growers Association of Hawaii and president of the Pineapple Research Institute of Hawaii. Both of these associations have passed resolutions favoring statehood for Hawaii and, since one of the main industries in Hawaii is the growing and canning of pineapples, I thought that you might like to hear just a little about its background, that is, its history and development, the way in which it has solved many of its problems, its contributions to the war effort, and its importance both to the mainland and to the economic and social life of the Islands.

As you know canned pineapple has become a symbol of Hawaii throughout the world. It was only about 60 years ago or in 1885 that the first pineapple plantings of a few acres were made by Capt. John Kidwell, about 3 or 4 miles from here near the present site of the University of Hawaii in the Manoa Valley. He imported and tested many varieties, selected the "Smooth Cayenne," as the best, and 5 years later or in 1890, made plantings near Pearl Harbor. It is interesting to note that this is the variety that still makes up a very high percentage of the acreage in the islands. Soon after the turn of the century, the regular uninterrupted production of Hawaiian canned pineapple was begun at Wahiawa, a few miles to the north of Pearl Harbor, and has since spread to several of the other islands.

In the years which have followed, the few acres planted to pineapple in Hawaii have increased to approximately 62,000. Production has risen from a few hundred tons annually in the early years of this century to approximately 600,000 tons, the finished products of which are valued at in excess of \$60,000,000. Hawaii now provides the United States with some 18,000,000 cases—roughly almost half a billion cans—of pineapple and pineapple juice each year, in addition to stock feed, citric acid, commercial alcohol for vinegar, and other byproducts.

The importance of this industry of course lies chiefly in its quantity production of a high-quality food which has become an accepted part of the American diet. The handling of this product through normal trade channels also represents a contribution to business activity in every State.

In the Territory pineapple is one of the two principal mainstays of the island's economy. Last year it provided year-round employment for about 10,000 men and women, and seasonal employment for approximately 10,000 more. In addition many more thousands, because of this industry, find employment with firms supplying the industry and with various institutions which its taxes help to support. I might add that normally the industry's employment is from 30 to 40 percent larger than at the present time, for it continues to suffer from a very serious labor shortage created by the war.

With an annual pay roll of over \$20,000,000, the eight pineapple companies maintain high wage rates which probably exceed the average for the American food industry, and in addition they provide plantation employees with free housing, medical care, and other perquisites.

The owners of this industry, like its employees, are numbered in many thousands. The largest producer, for example, has 5,300 shareholders, two-thirds of whom live in Hawaii. The second and third largest producers are divisions of mainland packing corporations having 15,000 and 28,000 shareholders respectively.

The growth of the pineapple industry to these proportions was achieved in the face of many serious production and canning problems, problems which it has always met with very little if any governmental assistance. Leadership in the field of agricultural research, for which producers now spend almost \$1,000,000 a year, has been one of the prime factors in their success. Research, for example, was responsible for the control of the mealy bug, a small fuzzy insect which serves as a "milch cow" for the ant, and which at one time threatened to wipe out the entire industry by causing a disease known as Pineapple wilt. Research resulted in a more efficient use of fertilizers and in the use of mulch paper at planting time to discourage the growth of weeds, equalize soil temperatures, and conserve moisture, and in the development of soil fumigants to control among other things another nemesis of the pineapple, the nematode, a microscopic eel-like organism.

Similarly, continuous improvement has taken place in the Hawaiian variety of the pineapple plant, known as the Smooth Cayenne, through plant introduction and the breeding and selection of better strains.

The industry itself developed the device which made real mass production possible, the Ginaca machine which automatically trims, sizes, and cores pineapples at a rate of up to 90 per minute.

Many other illustrations could be cited of the skill, foresight, and perseverance inherent in the rise of this industry, and each is a fascinating story in itself.

During the war Hawaiian pineapple producers had the distinction of being the only segment of the American food industry carrying on uninterrupted production under combat-zone conditions. In spite of these conditions through rigid industry inspection the same high standards of quality were maintained and there was no decline in the volume of production save that which occurred as a result of conditions beyond our control. Pineapple also has the distinction of being one of the few products on which no changes in prices have been made since the Federal price-control program became effective in March 1942. With very substantial increases in wages and costs of materials, producers have managed to operate only through more efficient practices resulting from research, increased mechanization of plantation operations, and improved processing techniques.

Substantial proportions of Hawaii's canned pineapple and pineapple juice were set aside during the war for the Armed Forces, at one period amounting to approximately two-thirds of the total pack. In addition to sending this large quantity of its products to our fighting men all over the world, these companies were able to assist the Army and Navy in numerous other ways. Large areas of pineapple lands, as well as warehouse space and building of various kinds, were made available for military installations. Many thousands of man-days of plantation and cannery labor were loaned to the services, along with field and transportation equipment of all kinds. Some foods other than pineapple were also produced, and various emergency services were rendered to the Army and Navy which are too numerous to mention.

On the whole, we believe our industry has reason for pride in its war job, as well as in the way in which it has served the consumers of America, and in the manner in which it has contributed to the economic and social progress of the Territory.

Certain statistical data on the industry has been submitted for your study [exhibits 8 a, b, 11 h], and we are hopeful that while you are in Hawaii you will have an opportunity to see its operations at first hand.

STATEMENT No. 5

PRESENTATION BY CHAUNCEY B. WIGHTMAN, SECRETARY, HAWAIIAN SUGAR PLANTERS' ASSOCIATION

For the past several months the Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association, representing 34 of the 35 sugar plantations in these islands, which in turn employ approximately 28,500 workers, has had in preparation a careful documentation of the splendid war record of this community. This document outlines in considerable detail the preparedness activities before the war started, and the extensive contributions made by both the community as a whole as well as the plantation after the Pearl Harbor attack. [Exhibit No. 29.]

We ask permission to introduce this document into the record of your investigation. There are several reasons why we should like to have it become a part of the record.

Originally this document was intended to answer certain unfair and untrue testimony written into the record of the Army's Board of Inquiry into the Pearl Harbor attack. Over a period of some years Hawaii has been a target of frequent criticism, aimed particularly at its economic structure, and a victim of misunderstanding resulting from incomplete information concerning the islands. If statehood will not cure this criticism and misunderstanding, it should at least help to reduce them.

The unfair and untrue testimony in the record of the Army's Board of Inquiry into the Pearl Harbor attack is a fair example of the criticism frequently aimed at Hawaii. The trustees and plantation members of our association deemed it advisable to refute this testimony by preparing a complete history of the cooperation extended the armed forces before and during the war just ended. Most of the criticism leveled at Hawaii could be refuted just as effectively as this has been.

However, as the collecting of material progressed, the document became more than a refutation; it built up into an impressive history of the extensive and important contributions to the Nation's war effort by a patriotic, able, and well-equipped community. That is the primary reason why it should be a part of the record of this investigation.

The qualifications that render a Territory eligible for statehood do not seem to be precisely defined. Some Territories have been accorded statehood when their population reached a certain mark. In the case of Hawaii the requirements would seem to be more severe than in most cases.

Hawaii's record of war effort is remarkable. When the attack came great burdens were thrust suddenly upon the people, upon business and industry, and upon all the facilities of the community. The demands made could never have been answered so efficiently if the Territory had not been so well equipped.

The Army and Navy called immediately upon the utilities for more electric power, more water, more telephone service, more transportation. These utilities, developed to serve a modern city, were able to take on these extra burdens. Calls were made upon the plantations for thousands of men, hundreds of trucks, dozens of bulldozers and tractors. Because the plantations were large, well-managed and efficient, they were able to send the thousands of men, rolling stock, and heavy machinery. No other economy or industrial system could have answered so swiftly and effectively.

Hardware stores, wholesale drug houses, lumber yards, machine shops, and all the other facilities of a modern community were well-stocked and ready to answer the many sudden demands.

The people were ready. They had been prepared and trained for such an emergency, and this document we desire to introduce shows how well prepared

they were and how patriotically they responded. The Red Cross, the blood bank, volunteer doctors and nurses, ambulance drivers, trucks equipped to be converted into ambulances, air raid and fire wardens were all ready, went to their assigned places and began work immediately.

The equipment available and the preparedness and ability of the people was not accidental. The interest of the United States in Hawaii has been primarily as a defense outpost, and when the emergency arrived Hawaii was ready to serve her purpose in every sense of the word. That she was ready was due largely to the economic structure of the Territory.

With the exception of a few raw materials such as sand, rock, and coral, and with the exception of the portion of the food that is produced here for local consumption, virtually all that Hawaii has—all that you have seen in the civilian parts of Hawaii—have been purchased on the mainland and brought here. To buy and bring here all the goods and building materials and machinery that have gone into the building of modern Hawaii, something had to be produced and sold to provide the money.

This presentation is not intended as a brief for the sugar industry, but sugar has been the major source of island income. Before the war, before the influx of defense and war workers, half the people of the islands derived their income directly or indirectly from the sugar industry. The percentage of the population depending upon sugar will increase as the war recedes and military and naval garrisons are reduced. A very large share of the sound economy of these islands depends upon sugar. Sugar helps build and maintain the schools that have educated the loyal and capable population of the islands; sugar helps build the highways, the utilities, and all the facilities. Consequently it is important that Hawaii's sugar industry has adequate support and protection from discrimination that it has suffered in the past. We believe this support and protection can best be assured us by statehood. We need and deserve voting representation in the Congress of the United States. As a Territory we have one Delegate in Congress, who has no vote. Statehood would give us two Senators and one or two Representatives.

At the present time there is an acute sugar shortage, and all producing areas are being urged to produce all they can as quickly as they can. This condition will not last, and producing areas cut off or reduced by war will eventually get back to normal levels. Then sugar will probably be put back on the quota system.

Sugar production and marketing is controlled by Congress, and Hawaii normally supplies between 12 and 14 percent of the national needs. As a Territory our representation in Congress is solely through our one Delegate. When we add up all the States on the mainland where sugar cane and sugar beets are grown and processed and where refineries for Cuban sugar are located, we find the total is 26. Those 26 States interested in sugar are represented in the Congress by 52 Senators and more than 250 Members of the House of Representatives; a clear majority of both Houses. Certainly Hawaii deserves more than one Delegate, not only to represent the sugar industry but to represent all of Hawaii's interests. Hawaii has amply proved her importance to the Nation, and that importance can best be preserved and fostered by adequate representation.

Even after serious losses in our plantation manpower, the sugar industry now employs approximately 28,500 workers. Modern and scientific agricultural methods have made them among the best-paid agricultural workers in the world. They have excellent health records and an excellent system of health protection. Most of the plantation communities are modern towns, and the others will be modernized as rapidly as possible. The plantations are unionized, and these employees are covered by national labor laws. Most of them possess a commendable degree of community pride, and their loyalty and patriotism has been demonstrated beyond challenge. Our modern plantations devote much effort and interest to the welfare and spirit of the workers.

It is our conviction that the sugar workers and all other workers in the Territory will respond beneficially to statehood status. The greater responsibilities of statehood to the electorate should make the average voter take his franchise more seriously. We feel, in simple justice, we are entitled to equal treatment along with the 48 States. Another reason for endorsing and urging statehood is the pride and higher spirit our people will derive from it. This pride and higher spirit should make for a better community, and better communities make for a stronger nation.

With your permission, gentlemen, I present this copy of the history of Hawaii's contributions to the war effort and ask that it be incorporated in the record of this hearing.

STATEMENT No. 6

(See p. 129)

LABOR RELATIONS IN HAWAII

(Statement to the House Subcommittee on Statehood by W. Harold Loper, chairman and public member of the Hawaii Employment Relations Board, January 8, 1946)

I have been asked to present evidence from the field of labor relations in Hawaii which may be pertinent to the issue of statehood at this time. The labor movement in Hawaii expanded rapidly during the war years, especially after the lifting of martial law in March of 1944, developing for the first time into a major factor in the economic and political life of these islands. Other witnesses to follow will no doubt submit figures on this rapid growth. The transfer of jurisdiction over labor from military control to civil authority was completed with the establishment of the Territorial war labor board in June of 1944. During 18 months as cochairman and public member of the Territorial war labor board, I saw nothing in the employer-employee relationships here, nor in the activities of labor unions, to indicate that the workers of Hawaii are not ready to carry the full responsibilities of citizenship. On the contrary, there was much to indicate just the opposite.

The coming of the war labor board to Hawaii may itself be taken as an indication that local employers and unions were ready and anxious to throw off military control over wages and labor disputes and subject themselves to the same necessary wartime controls as were operating in the States.

The attitude of employers and employees alike was one of cooperation with the board in the full realization of the necessity of the controls. Out of some 1,800 applications for wage adjustments handled by the staff and the board, only 22 applications for reconsideration of board action were filed, and only one appeal was taken to the National Board in Washington.

The same attitude was evident with respect to labor disputes. Out of a total of 15 labor disputes certified to the Territorial War Labor Board, 8 were settled by agreement of the parties and withdrawn from our docket; 4 were closed by directive orders of the Territorial War Labor Board; and 3 were appealed to Washington to be settled by directive of the National Board upholding the action of the local board. There was no problem of compliance with our directive orders during the 14 months of the boards experience prior to VJ-day. Enforcement in wage stabilization cases involved penalties for noncompliance in 6 or 8 cases out of some 200 cases of alleged violation, most of which were brought into voluntary compliance upon request or were closed with no penalty.

Perhaps the most significant fact in the field of labor relations bearing on the issue of statehood is the interracial character of all labor unions. There is, in the labor history of Hawaii, a record of early attempts to organize and operate along race lines. The fallacy of this approach to their problems is now recognized by labor unions, and they have learned their lesson well. I know of no union in Hawaii which draws the race line or will sign a contract providing for wage differentials based on race. (Wage stabilization principles of the War Labor Board, of course, would not permit the approval of such differentials.) The significance of this for citizenship and for statehood is obvious. I know of no evidence of bloc voting along race lines in union elections. This refusal, on the part of unions, to allow racial distinctions to disrupt their own organization carries over into the political field, reinforcing the opposition to race lines in that area. Union members in Hawaii show by the manner in which they conduct their own affairs that they believe democracy to be a matter of ideals and loyalties—not one of geography and of race.

The war record of unions in Hawaii with respect to the no-strike pledge was good. Figures I have seen for the mainland indicate that less than one-tenth of 1 percent of all available man-days were lost due to strikes. Figures for the Territory are even better. "Only three strikes during the life of the Territorial War Labor Board prior to VJ-day, involving less than 500 workers and perhaps a loss of 1,000 man-days of work, stand on our record to mar it."

It is true that the record with respect to strikes since the end of the war has not been so good, and the fine spirit of cooperation in labor relations during the war has since shown some deterioration. These local disputes, however, are

small indeed in comparison with the postwar labor problems which developed on the mainland, and they could hardly be used as an argument against statehood. The point I would like to make is that with the rapid growth of unionism here, there is coming also a rapid maturing of the quality of the relationship of employers and employees—a growing disposition to deal with their problems in a straightforward, realistic manner.

This developing maturity of the local labor movement was recognized by the Territorial legislature at its 1945 session in the passage of the Hawaii Employment Relations Act (otherwise known as the Little Wagner Act) guaranteeing to agricultural workers not covered by the National Labor Relations Act the rights of organization and of collective bargaining. It is my understanding that only one other State, the State of Wisconsin, has such a law designed primarily to cover employees in the field of agriculture. The Hawaii Employment Relations Act provides for a tripartite board of three members and a conciliator. Unlike the National Labor Relations Act, it lists unfair labor practices on the part of unions and their members, as well as those on the part of employers. It is still too early to report on the operation of this new law, as the board is just beginning to function. The first election of collective bargaining representatives among agricultural workers under the jurisdiction of the Hawaii Employment Relations Board is to be scheduled on the big island in the near future.

It must be admitted that the development of a full-fledged labor movement came late in Hawaii as compared with the mainland in general. As I have indicated, however, this does not mean that we are now far behind mainland communities in our methods of dealing with labor problems.

STATEMENT NO. 7

(See p. 210)

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII

(Statement of Chuck Mau, supervisor, city and county of Honolulu)

This Organic Act of the Territory of Hawaii, being an act of the Congress of the United States, authorizes the Territorial legislature to create counties and town and city municipalities within the Territory and to provide for the government thereof (sec. 56, organic act). Pursuant to this authorization, the Territorial legislature created four political subdivisions, namely, the counties of Hawaii, Maui, Kauai, and the city and county of Honolulu.

Geographically, the city and county of Honolulu consists of that portion of the Territory commonly known as the island of Oahu and all other islands in the Territory not included in the other named counties (sec. 650, Revised Laws of Hawaii, 1945). The population of the city and county is approximately 350,000. This political subdivision was originally created by act of the Territorial legislature in 1905. At that time it was designated as the county of Oahu. In 1907 the legislature increased the jurisdictional area of the then county of Oahu and established and incorporated the present city and county of Honolulu. Since the city and county is a creature of the legislature, all of its powers must of necessity emanate from the legislature.

The governmental structure of the city and county follows the pattern of some of the larger city and county governments on the mainland. It is headed by a mayor and a seven-member board of supervisors who are elected for a 2-year term by United States citizens who are qualified voters of the city and county. The remaining elective officials are the treasurer, clerk, auditor, and sheriff. The other department heads of the city and county, including the attorney, the comptroller, the engineer, the superintendent of buildings, the fire chief, the physician, and the public prosecutor, are appointed by the mayor, subject to the approval of the board of supervisors. The board, which meets as a whole or by committees twice a week or oftener, has been granted, by the Territorial legislature, very broad legislative power over all local matters. The legislative powers of the board include the power to enact and enforce, within the limits of the city and county, all necessary ordinances covering local police, fire, and health matters, including sanitation, inspection of buildings, condemnation of unsafe structures, plumbing, sewers, dairies, milk, fish, cemeteries,

morgues, the collection and disposal of rubbish and garbage, the regulation, restriction, and control of the location, building, and use of tenements; the appointment of sanitary and other inspectors; the use of streets, highways, public thoroughfares, public places, alleys, and sidewalks; the limits within which wooden buildings or structures shall not be erected; and broad general authority over a number of other matters of local concern (sec. 6521, Revised Laws of Hawaii, 1945).

We call attention to the salaries paid our department heads. The present average salary is \$10,300 per annum. Reference to the municipal year book of 1944 establishes that these salaries are considerably higher than those paid to similar city and county officials in cities and counties of equivalent population on the mainland. It is the thought of the city and county administration that in order to attract qualified and able men into government service, we must be willing to pay for their qualifications and ability.

It may be of interest to this committee to know that the city and county administration was prepared for Pearl Harbor. Mayor Lester Petrie and the board of supervisors created a major disaster council which was composed of top professional and business men. With funds provided by the board, the council purchased equipment such as cots, splints, medicines, and other medical and hospital supplies. It also assisted in the organization and maintenance of a blood bank. When the infamous 7th came, it sprang into instant action. Its equipment and personnel, including blood plasma, were rushed to the aid of the military and naval services and to civilian casualties. The results of this preparedness for this dire emergency should be recorded in local history and should be called to the attention of the Congress and the people of the mainland.

The city and county was the first American community to put rent control into effect. The city and county rent control ordinance was enacted immediately after the inception of the war and became effective on December 13, 1941. The local control of rent ceilings and of the eviction of tenants has continued throughout the war and is still in effect. So far as we know, all other American communities which have become congested due to war conditions have been put under Federal OPA control through order of the President in establishing such localities as defense rental areas. However, the Federal Government, after close scrutiny of our local rent control ordinance and administration, has seen fit to leave such control in the hands of the city and county government.

As indicative of the continued progress of this community, we would like to bring to your attention our present plan for a complete ultramodern system of sewage disposal. This plan was initiated by the city prior to 1944, at which time the mayor appointed a committee of engineers and businessmen designated as the Honolulu sewerage committee, to consider the problem of constructing an improved sewerage system for Honolulu. The sewerage committee, with the approval of the board of supervisors, obtained the services of the engineering firm of Metcalf & Eddy to make a complete and detailed study of Honolulu's sewerage system and make recommendations for the construction of a modern system which would adequately accommodate the expected future expansion of the city. This engineering firm is nationally known in the field of sanitation. Its report to the Honolulu sewerage committee, dated December 31, 1944, contained recommendations for a complete new system, including advanced designed sewage-treatment plants, at an approximate cost of \$15,000,000. (See vol. I, Metcalf & Eddy report to Honolulu sewerage committee.) The Territorial legislature, at request of the city, appropriated in 1945 half a million dollars for the completion of the necessary engineering work in connection with this far-reaching project.

The financial structure of the city and county of Honolulu differs from that of some of the mainland counties in that it has no tax-levying powers. The amount to be raised from real and personal property taxation within the county is set by legislative action. This amount constitutes approximately 66 percent of the total operating revenues received by the city and county for general governmental expenditures and permanent improvements. The establishment of the rate of taxation is determined by the budget as submitted by the city and county government, subject to a maximum limitation of \$1,000,000 to be collected from real property taxation and \$2,250,000 to be collected from personal property taxation. The administration of the collection of these taxes is in the hands of the Territorial government and is handled by the Territorial treasurer and tax commissioner. The remaining approximate 34 percent of the operating revenue received by the city and county is derived from franchise taxes, license fees, including the motor vehicle weight fees, district court fines and forfeitures, garbage-collection

fees, support received from the Territorial department of public welfare for certain indigent cases which are under the jurisdiction of that department, and license fees received through the liquor commission. The total available resources of the city and county for the year 1945 were in the amount of \$12,449.5 0. From this revenue, several large fixed charges and mandated appropriations had to be met. Among these fixed charges are \$1,300,000 for the police department, \$950,000 for school purposes, \$700,000 for interest, sinking-fund installments and serial bond redemption, and \$350,000 for park and recreational purposes. We are submitting a more detailed statement of revenue and expenditures, designated exhibit 46a. We are also submitting copies of the comptroller's report for 1944, which we are designating exhibit 46b.

In regard to the financial standing of the city and county, the law permits the issuance of bonds up to five percent of the assessed value of the real property in the county. That latest available figures as to the net assessable value of the real property in the city and county of Honolulu is \$146,750,000, which would allow bonds to be issued up to the total amount of \$7,337,500. As of December 31, 1946, the amount of outstanding general obligations of the city and county was \$6,539,000. Of this amount, \$2,809,296 is an obligation of the board of water supply, a semiautonomous body, which provides each year from its revenues a sum sufficient to meet its obligations as to interest and principal payments on its share of the bonds outstanding, so that in actuality the city's obligations amount to \$3,729,034.

The city and county has never defaulted in the payment of interest or principal on any of its outstanding bond obligations, and has invariably received a substantial premium on the sale of its bonds. In its publication, *Manual of Government Securities*—American and Foreign, Moody's Investors Service of New York rates the general obligation bonds of the city and county at "A," which is the highest rating.

STATEMENT No. 8

(See p. 253)

STATEHOOD IN HAWAII

(By Martin E. Alan)

Since both proponents as well as those who oppose statehood for the Territory of Hawaii from the beginning have frequently dragged the question of the Japanese race across the face of the picture of Hawaii's thirst for statehood, it might be well to present a picture of the many angles involved.

I have noticed for several years that those who use the racial issue the loudest in their cry for statehood are politicians (professional and otherwise), and those in business and local industry who wish to depend, or must depend, on the Japanese vote, their trade, or fear of reprisal, which reprisal could take any of several forms—such as boycott or bloc voting.

We will take up the alien-born Japanese. There is not less than 100,000 of them in the Territory. They have entered the Territory by hundreds every year from 1920 until 1941. In 1920 the Federal Government placed immigration from Japan on a very highly restricted basis; and in 1924 stopped it entirely—from a legal standpoint. Yet they have continued to come and go freely. Many come brazenly through the port of Honolulu via the fishing sampans. Others landed on isolated island shores and stayed in mountain or inaccessible plantation camps until they had learned a smattering of "pidgin," at which time they went to relatives and friends. That part would be easy, because the majority of Japanese immigrants came from one prefecture in Japan—Hiroshima.

The greater part of the younger illegal entries came as replacements to relieve others who were already here and ready to return to Japan. In 1940 I pointed out to G-2 on the big island that this exchange was being made while Japanese sailors were visiting and touring the big island during the visits of the enemy training ships. I spoke to the officer to whom I reported regularly of the fact that on each occasion I saw familiar faces going back to the ship in Japanese uniforms. In the well-known case of Mario Sato—which the local Japanese wish to discredit—clearly brought out that such events took place. I was always of the opinion that even he was one of these exchanges who had been caught at it.

Now, we are down to the more or less permanent alien Japanese residents. The older generations of the Japanese are a hard-working (for themselves) tightly woven group. In every community which is predominantly Japanese, there is one male who is the virtual dictator of the balance. It is this group who dictate the policies for the rest of the people to follow. Though these leaders may change from time to time, one needs only to live among them a short time to learn who they are. Not many of the non-Japanese in the Territory dare to speak openly of things seen or heard concerning them—whether alien or Nisei. The older generation never mix with or show friendship to the white race unless it will help them as a group or as individuals. I have found out these things over a period of years by asking questions and observing them and their actions minutely.

Leaving the aliens for a moment let us notice the second and third generation Japanese. They are known as the Nisei and Sansei. Many of the third generation are too young to be influenced one way or the other. In outward appearance, there is no particular difference between them and the Nisei. In order to ever Americanize them it would be necessary to divorce them completely from their parents, Shintoism, and their warlike traditions. As it is now, the American language is rarely heard within the average Japanese home, and before the war it was only heard or spoken in public when it was necessary to use it—such as, talking to a non-Japanese. I could not help but notice that the V. V. Corps at the University of Hawaii in the early days of the war did not volunteer in a body until after the statement was published in the press that they would not be sent into the Pacific area as combat troops, where there was danger of their possible combat with relatives, etc. The flimsy excuse was advanced by the War (?) Department that it would be too easy for the enemy to infiltrate our positions, and that there was danger of our Caucasian troops shooting the Niseis by mistake. It has never been shown that their volunteering was anything but a sacrifice for the advancement and clean bill of health for the ones who were left behind. No draft was called for these boys until it was determined that they would not be sent to conquer enemy-held islands. Public statements were published at the time by representatives of Nisei organizations in the island here that, "it would not be fair to them to ask them to fight against possible relatives"; and, another quote, "that if they could fight in Europe, they would show their love and patriotism for America."

The Japanese language schools flourished here for many years through the legal support of the Supreme Court of the United States. It is deplorable indeed that such a decision was rendered without a prior thorough investigation of the need for such a set of schools for the advancement of Americanism. These schools have gone out of style since the war started in 1941. Their usefulness is ended, and their purpose served. It was also a very flimsy excuse that was presented to the Supreme Court to show cause why they should be allowed to continue.

While they existed, they were strictly traditional and militaristic. They taught imperialism to the nth degree. No class work, studies, or home work was allowed to interfere with the schedules of the language schools, or with their plans. I have seen school children of all ages get up at 5 a. m. in order to attend language school before 8 o'clock, then return to these language schools after the public schools closed for the day about 1 p. m. And these children spent all day on Saturdays also in these schools; some to study, some to work for the teacher.

No child was permitted to enter these schoolrooms without first bowing to the living quarters of the teacher who personified the Emperor and Japan to them. Some took off the hat, others bowed. These acts and teachings clearly show the presence of dual allegiance—if there ever was an allegiance toward America. In the schools, the children memorized pages at a time of their lessons. The omission or misspeaking of a single word or character meant a thump on that unfortunate's head. How did I know? My wife and I took the first-year Japanese together in one of these country language schools.

My present observation shows me that present-day, postwar plantation camp life in the Japanese camps has reverted almost to the status they enjoyed prewar. At that time, one could enter one of these camps and truly believe he had entered Japan. When the Japanese field or office workers go home in the afternoon to have their hot baths, it is at this time that the figurative American flag comes down from over the camp and is replaced by the "fried egg" flag of Nippon. These people, older, as well as the very young, discard their American style of garb, and don their traditional kimonos, gettas, tabis, and obis.

The American tongue is never heard among them. Only to an outsider would they find it expedient to talk English or Hawaiian.

Among themselves, the Japanese people practice an impeccable degree of etiquette. Two old ladies who had not seen each other for weeks or months, will start bowing to each other while still approaching as much as a couple of hundred feet apart. Their speech is a marvel of politeness—and tradition. No wish for an ancestor is left unsaid. Yet, these same people, though the recent war has shown that they all understand English and speak it after a fashion, will show the extreme discourtesy of deliberately talking the Japanese language in front of us, even though they be a guest in our home. It has happened time after time to me here in Hawaii—and no apology for so doing.

In reference to the Japanese fishing sampans of prewar days: The Territorial or Federal Government agency charged with the responsibility of keeping track of these fishermen (chiefly Department of Immigration), were extremely negligent in not keeping a sufficient check on these alien workers. The only record, aside from a little paper recording, was a small brass "dogtag." No fingerprint. No picture. No way to check how many different men held any one tag in any specified time. The door was wide open for any number of illegal entries from Japan. And it would shock our committee to ever find out exactly how many did enter that way over the past 20 years prior to December 7, 1941. There is no way to do more than estimate the possibilities. There are hundreds of unsupported statements which could be made, that is, unsupported by legal evidence. It is safely presumable that none of them will ever come forward and admit they entered in such a manner. And this brings us to smuggling—all the way from humans to items of trade and warfare. Not so long before the war, in the big island (of Hawaii) a large cache of arms was found in a cave. It included well-known American brands of high-powered rifles, as well as Browning autoloading items. Some folks might raise the question that importation of American firearms would not constitute smuggling. True, if legal. But we all know that if such firearms were brought in legally, they would have been registered with the Territory and with the local police. They were brought in for an illegal purpose; therefore, it is smuggling. That is only one instance. I shall always feel positive that there was another cache in Waimanu Valley. I knew that if I followed the man long enough who lived at the foot of the Waipio trail, I'd find the hiding place.

Subsequent facts have shown I was on the right track. Though the cache of arms was never revealed, it was found out that the mouth of the Waimanu Valley was used by crews of midget submarines, or similar small crews.

For two full summers my wife and I lived with the people in the Waipio Valley. We saw and heard many things. I had heard that aliens were coming in by that route. And late in the afternoon of two different days I noticed numbers of strange faces loafing about the house of the man, Nakashima, living at the foot of the trail. Then late in these respective nights, we hid in the shadows of the old mango tree. After midnight, while a slow drizzle of rain was falling, these men, 18 on the first occasion, 20 on the second, filed silently up the trail carrying their little bundles tied in pieces of silk cloth. We followed the second group to see where they went. They stopped for a short time at a house a mile from the head of the trail. Just before daylight they left in groups of two and three. I asked a young part-Hawaiian boy where these men were headed, and he replied, "Oh, they go mauka." Which indicated they were bound for various upland plantation camps scattered clear across the island. It is my conviction that this valley was not the only scene of entries. There are miles upon miles of seashore on the big island alone where such things could occur without interference.

The so-called financial gain to be derived from statehood is just so much fanciful thinking. Statehood in itself would not raise the price nor cost of sugar or pineapples, or any other commodity exported from here. It is extremely doubtful if the change to statehood would raise the level of the tourist trade. The inclination is to visit non-States rather than States. It is more intriguing to go somewhere different from home. Especially a tropical territory of the United States holds promise of strange lands and peoples with adventure. Whereas, a State would seem too "civilized" for some tourists.

There are many governmental functions which would not change either in personnel or in habits. A few departments would have to have their cost of support transferred to the "new State." It is probable that as a State we would be eligible for Federal funds we may not get now. Statehood would not in the

least part reduce the cost of living or travel to or within the islands. Only competition and fair-trade practices can do that. Because of the lack of competition in the Territory in the channels of trade and industry, the costs of living and carrying on a small business has been and continues to be unreasonably high. We are now brought face to face with the business monopolies of the past, which to a great extent still exist. The so-called Big Five are not a myth. Years ago they were so many families. Later, as they grew and absorbed the debts of various plantations their power grew. They are now five giants of Hawaiian industry. The size of a business or corporation does not signify its unworthiness to exist under any particular regime. It can easily show keen business acumen. In the present case it indicates the presence of noncompetition. Because these firms do not compete against each other. Each carries different lines of goods, and perhaps through coincidence shall I say, keep a common level of prices—all high.

As to the large land holdings, some are owned outright by heirs of royal estates; some are leased for long terms from the Territory; some also are owned by various plantations, who in turn are controlled by the few big shipping factors. There are very few independently owned sugar or pineapple plantations in the islands. Distributorships of the various items sold in the islands as consumer goods and luxuries were obtained while the business interests were young and growing. These have been exclusive franchises, and no other dealer or businessman may "crash the gate." He must buy from existing agencies. And on first one pretext or another they maintain a level of retail prices too high relative to similar goods in the mainland. And Statehood will never change the situation.

The final portion of my statement relates to the D. P. I.—abbreviation for our public school system, department of public instruction.

When I was in the Territory 25 years ago, the old time three "R's" were the basis for teaching the youngsters. It is a recognized fact in educational circles that heritage and background hold a most important part in educational achievements. It also limits, or permits, advanced methods of such instruction. Men and women educated locally prior to 15 years ago have a sound knowledge of learning; the degree of this learning depends upon how long the individual was permitted to attend school. In those early days, nearly all students completed the eighth grade.

The high schools of the territory were very much fewer and farther apart than at present, which is understandable for two reasons: lack of finances, and, most influentially felt, the attitude of the plantation managements. Key men of these plantations have for many years asserted that the youth of the Territory were getting far too much education. It is easy to see they didn't want too much competition in brains (?), nor to become smart enough to realize they were being cheated on wages. While the populace was being kept as ignorant as possible, it was very easy to pay top skills at the rate of—and I mean top wage for the entire industry—65 cents per hour. These top skills were as carpenters, plumbers, electricians, etc. And 20 years ago and beyond, these skills paid off at \$1.50 to \$2.50 per day. What have the foregoing figures to do with the topic of education? Just this! No real effort was made to improve the school system because it would teach the children the value of money as well as of labors.

As long as the voting power and opinionating power of the general public was kept low through ignorance, there would be no demands on those in political power to improve the D. P. I. in such a manner as to benefit the students and their adult life. Where is my authority for the statements I just made? I have talked to section lunas, head lunas, managers, and educators all over the Territory over a period of 8 or 9 years. The answers to my questions are the basis of the above statements.

When I was here 25 years ago, everyone spoke Hawaiian or understood Hawaiian in order to be able to converse with all nationalities living here. The English language at that time was liberally sprayed with Hawaiian words; that is, not pidgin!!

The DPI underwent a change of policy about 15 years ago, when the administration changed. The results of this change definitely prove that education and politics have no part of each other. In other words, politics should never be allowed to control the administrative staff of any educational institution. The commissioners of any board of education should be chosen from the ranks

of specially trained educators who have the welfare of young minds at heart—ones who realize the limitations of young minds for whom they must plan. It is a well-known fact that at one operation, one cannot pour a gallon of water into a quart bottle. Likewise, one cannot pour a gallon of advanced methods of education into a quart-sized mind. That mind must be developed through a background of learning first. Also, one must instill a desire for more learning in the minds and hearts of the prospective students. I made a survey of grammar-school students on the big Island in 1940 and 99 percent of the answers to my questions indicated the life ambition of the males was to work for the plantation, and of the girls—to work at “hoe hana” long enough to get a man, then to raise all the kids they could. Their ideas of the proper-sized family varied from 5 to 10 children. A few said, “many as can get, 15, 20 mebbe.” Such ideas of breeding are the result of ignorance. We in the Territory must raise the ambitions and educational levels for the working class of our public for two or three generations before we should properly think of Statehood. Only then may we have a class of leadership born and reared locally who would be capable and fitted to lead our Territory into and through statehood.

For the past 15 years the DPI has not obtained quality teachers locally. I have seen hundreds, both personally and records of their opinions through the local press, who are most definitely not capable of teaching growing minds. They come to the public schools with a 5- or 6-year certificate from the University of Hawaii. When these same teachers talk to nonteachers and nonstudents, they speak only fair English on the whole; However, when among themselves, and in class, they revert to pidgin. Some more so than others. Less than 2 weeks ago I was riding the university bus going toward town. Of the forty-odd passengers aboard, more than 30 were students from the university. I have to smile to myself as I recalled the local claims made public of the quality of our own university of dear old Hawaii Nei. Not one student within my hearing made the least effort to speak even decent English. It was pidgin, at its best.

So, it is this sort of students we must choose our coming teaching staff from? Is it any wonder the whites of the Territory who can afford it send their children to the States to be educated? The ones here today who are crying the loudest for statehood are ashamed of their own school system to the extent they sent their own children stateside to school. There has been no improvement for 15 years in the quality of teachers turned out locally. Further, it very definitely requires more than mere education to qualify a person as a teacher. It needs an abundance of child understanding, and an abundance of love and devotion to their work and efforts. I have failed in recent years to note any slight degree of either subquality among locally trained teachers.

And imported teachers from the States brought here on the exchange basis or hired outright, soon learn they cannot do anything contrary to the set policy of the DPI. If one of them, or any other teacher, submits ideas of improvement—they are promptly squelched by their immediate superiors, second or third offenses call for dismissal. Oh, of course, if such ideas advance the prestige of the DPI oligarchy, or follow the set ideas of this group, the subcommittee gets a pat on the back and sometimes publicity.

The DPI makes the serious mistake of trying to teach children here by methods too advanced for them to assimilate. Go back to the three R's for two or three more generations. For 15 years you have cooperated fully with the Japanese language schools of the Territory. If not openly, at least tacitly. You have been since 1900 obligated to teach Americanism to your students. You have not done so since 1930. When I say “not done so” I mean that you have not seen to it that Americanism got top priority over foreign culture, allegiance, and inculcation. You implied approval, when it has been allowed for many years that the Japanese language schools took precedent in the needs of their own plans and curriculum, over that of the public schools. Such cowardly attitude needs more than rebuke; it needs a complete renovation from the top down—and I mean now. The mishandling of our school system is a good example of how all the phases of our local government are handled. And they have the unmitigated gall to wish for statehood. Details of my assertions are all around us. Look at them.

The whole issue revolves to one main point as to the advisability of statehood, namely, the loyalty or disloyalty of the predominantly numerous Japanese race. One cannot accept the figures of the 1940 census. No effort was made on the big island to accurately enumerate the alien population. Of 20 enumerators, 19 were

Japanese. I know of several instances where they did not travel to the "mauka camps" of certain plantations to get their figures. They made no effort to find out if there were more than the legitimate number supposed to be there. It is inconsistent to believe that 100 percent of the Japanese on Hawaii did not know of the "imports" of Japanese aliens via Waipio.

The alien disloyalty in the early days of the war is amply demonstrated in the fact that Japanese operated vegetable gardens were allowed to go fallow subsequent to December 7, 1941, and remain that way for a long time. Some have not yet gone back to cultivation. The only vegetables available on Kauai in the war years were raised on plantations after a plea had been made to help out the vital shortage. Some items were imported from other islands.

Another point showing the willing disloyalty of all classes of Japanese, is the fact they did not come forward within the first 30 days of the war and reveal the traitors or would-be traitors among them. Ones who were or could be dangerous to the American war effort. The only ones arrested or confined in the first year, were on the information gained prior to the war and through non-Japanese channels.

There are some who will point to the numbers of war bonds the Japanese have bought; then with a loud voice scream from the housetops how patriotic they are. Purchase of American war bonds is not a measure of patriotism for anyone. It is the soundest of good business sense, a wise investment. Speaking of famous battalions in Europe's battles. None are braver, none are more heroic, than our own marines who showed the world how to fight and perform deeds of bravery far and beyond the call of duty. In every battle their such deeds were so numerous, that nothing short of miracles was ever noticed. So, in fact, any battalion's battle records should not be dragged in the mud of public scrutiny by using them as an excuse to attain statehood.

The sensible and sane thing to do now by all factions in Hawaii, is to forget statehood for the time being. Get together and work like beavers to clean their own house and houses to the nth degree. Improve themselves and their own local government and its functions so completely that no outsider can see just cause for further improvement. Properly educate our younger folks for the next three generations, try to improve the learning and lot of the older ones as much as possible. Throw out alien customs, intrigue, and propaganda. And truly, wholeheartedly, and in good faith try to Americanize every living soul living in and making his or her living in the present Territory of dear old Hawaii Nei.

STATEMENT No. 9

(See p. 305)

BRIEF SUBMITTED BY HAWAIIAN HOMES COMMISSION TO STATEHOOD COMMITTEE,
U. S. CONGRESS, ON HAWAIIAN HOMES COMMISSION MATTERS, HONOLULU, T. H.

The Hawaiian Homes Commission Act of 1920 was approved on July 9, 1921, by the Congress of the United States of America. It set aside approximately 200,000 acres of public land for homesteading by people of Hawaiian ancestry.

The commission, known as the Hawaiian Homes Commission, was set up by this act composed of five members, all of whom are appointed by the Governor, the members to serve 5 years without pay.

The original act also provided a revolving fund to be known as the Hawaiian home loan fund of \$1,000,000. This amount was increased in 1928 to \$2,000,000. This was built up from the rentals of Hawaiian home lands leased through the commissioner of public lands, together with 30 percent of the annual Territorial receipts from sugarcane lands and water licenses. Much of the above-mentioned amount of \$2,000,000 was drawn upon for capital expenditures—water, roads, buildings, et cetera. This revolving fund was also used to meet operational and maintenance costs. In the year 1935 this fund was pretty well depleted causing the local legislature some concern. It, therefore, appointed a holdover committee, consisting of Messrs. Joseph R. Farrington, now Delegate to Congress; William H. Heen and Joseph L. Silva of the Territorial senate; and Messrs. Roy A. Vitousek, Clem Gomes, and the late Arthur Akina of the house of representatives, to make an investigation into the affairs of the Hawaiian Homes Commis-

sion and to report back to the 1937 session of the Territorial legislature. (Refer to report submitted to the legislature March 5, 1937).

To carry on this work the legislature in 1937 appropriated the sum of \$239,400 and in 1939, \$215,800, out of the general revenues of the Territory for operational costs and such other permanent improvements as were necessary.

In 1941 the legislature again passed an act appropriating another \$2,000,000 for the revolving fund under the same process as was originally done, to wit, 30 percent of the revenues derived from the rentals of public lands and water licenses yearly until the full amount of \$2,000,000 was realized. It also set aside definitely all sums derived from the rental of "available lands" for operational expenses, this producing approximately \$60,000 a year. The act also permits the augmenting of these funds from moneys out of the general fund of the Territory, which it has done liberally, for the biennium 1943-45 the sum of \$59,314; for the biennium 1945-47, \$83,061.

The first homesteaders moved onto Kalamaula in 1923 on the island of Molokai, comprising 22 agricultural lots as well as 32 residence lots. In 1924 residential lots were opened up at Keaukaha, island of Hawaii. Also in 1924, 40-acre agricultural lots were opened up at Hoolehua, island of Molokai. This subdivision is known as the Hoolehua Homesteads. Large financial outlays were made in this particular area. In 1930 residential lots were opened at Nanakuli, island of Oahu. In 1937 residential lots back of Punchbowl Hill of this city, were also opened up.

The residential-homestead projects have been successful and have accomplished the purpose of which the Hawaiian Homes Act was intended. In all, some 2,888 Hawaiians or Part-Hawaiians now live within the areas of the various residential homestead projects. In practically all cases, these Hawaiians have been removed from the congested areas into more healthy and wholesome environments; they own their own homes and have, with a few exceptions, fulfilled their financial obligations to the Hawaiian Homes Commission.

The commission is of the firm belief that such projects which allow the Hawaiians to own their own homes in localities where there are opportunities of employment, must be developed to the fullest extent in the earliest possible time. To that end, the commission has taken steps to reactivate the program of the full development of the residential homestead areas which was interrupted by the war. The commission believes that the amount of \$1,000 to which it is limited to loan homesteaders on residential lots is not a sufficient amount under present building costs, to allow the further proper development of these projects. A loan to the maximum of \$3,000 for each homesteader would be more in line with present conditions.

In contrast to the satisfactory development of the residential homestead areas, we have the unhappy history of the agricultural homestead areas on the island of Molokai. Moved onto these lonely and arid lands before any provisions had been made for water, roads, or utilities, and with little opportunity for outside employment, the homesteaders were supposed to earn their living by farming. Under such conditions the project was doomed from the start and, but for the development of pineapple production on their lands, it is certain that most of the homesteaders could not have survived on their holdings.

Over the period of years which has elapsed since the homesteaders were moved to the agricultural areas of Molokai, a good system of roads has been built and utilities have been installed, but, over that long period of years, the homesteaders have not only been denied water with which to irrigate their lands but no water system has yet been installed which is adequate to provide for their barest domestic requirements. Without water for domestic requirements, the homesteaders suffer great hardships and without water for irrigation they are denied any chance of success in farming.

As is the case in the matter of loans to residential homesteaders, the commission believes that the amount of \$3,000 to which it is limited to loan agricultural homesteaders is now too low. The commission believes that it should be allowed to loan up to \$5,000 to such homesteaders.

The major requests which the Hawaiian Homes Commission have made and will again make of the Territorial legislature are these:

To amend the Hawaiian Homes Act to allow a maximum loan of \$3,000 to homesteaders in residential areas.

To amend the Hawaiian Homes Act to allow a maximum loan of \$5,000 to homesteaders on agricultural areas.

To amend the Hawaiian Homes Act to allow each homesteader in agricultural areas a house lot not to exceed 5 acres and agricultural land not to exceed 35 acres. This to allow agricultural homesteaders to live in communities rather than scattered over the whole area.

To provide \$350,000 for the development of the domestic water system.

To provide \$3,000,000 for the start of an irrigation system.

These proposed requests will, it is believed, receive the favorable consideration of the Territorial legislature. If so, they will be finally determined by the Congress of the United States. It is hoped that that body will give them prompt and favorable consideration.

The Territorial legislature of 1945 passed Joint Resolution No. 6 memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to make available as Hawaiian home lands, a certain parcel of land comprising 12.455 acres situated on the island of Maui, T. H.

The Commission is heartily in favor of this measure and respectfully requests your approval of same. It is the commission's plan to subdivide this area into residential lots that will allow the small wage earner living in this vicinity an opportunity to own a small tract on which he can build his home.

Dated January 7, 1946, Honolulu, T. H.

STATEMENT No. 10

(See p. 380)

THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION AND THE PUBLIC UTILITIES

(Statement by V. B. Libbey, chairman, public utilities commission)

The public utilities in the Territory have operated under regulation by the public utilities commission since 1913. The statute provides for a "strong, independent" commission with very complete powers as to investigation, the determination of rates, rules and practices, and control over security issues. The commission does not have jurisdiction over the rates of steam railroads, inter-island steamship lines or air lines—this having been reserved by Congress for the ICC, the Maritime Commission, and the CAA, respectively. The statute provides that investigations into the affairs of these utilities may be made by the commission, and that it shall be the commission's duty to effect necessary relief or remedy by the institution and prosecution of appropriate proceedings.

Commission funds are provided through a tax on the utilities based in part on capital and in part on gross revenue. Some \$50,000 per year is made available. A reserve has been accumulated, and it is the feeling of the members of the commission that the work is amply financed. The legislature has made special appropriations in the past as the need appeared.

The commission consists of five commissioners appointed by the Governor—two from Oahu and one each from the islands of Hawaii, Maui, and Kauai. One of the Oahu commissioners is elected chairman by the commission. The members devote only part-time to commission work, attending meetings and hearings as required and are paid at the rate of \$7 per day for work performed. I think that it can be said that the Governor has been able to find competent men of good will willing to devote themselves to this work.

A permanent staff is employed consisting of an administrative secretary, an engineer and an assistant, an auditor and an assistant, a common carrier investigator, and the necessary stenographic and clerical assistants. The attorney general serves as counsel. The commission has not hesitated to retain special consultants as required. Salaries have been fixed that, it is felt, are ample to attract men of the required ability. At the present time the staff is depleted—the engineer serving as a captain in the Navy, and the position of assistant engineer awaiting a qualified applicant.

It is the feeling of the commission that the people of the Territory are generally receiving adequate utility service at reasonable costs. Extensions of service have been made whenever there was prospect that the business that would develop would, in the reasonably near future, pay an appropriate share of the total expense. Electric service has been so generally available that no one has

been able to suggest how advantage would be taken of the national plan for rural electrification or other Federal aid. In the matter of rural electrification practically all sugar and pineapple plantation camps are electrified and are generally furnished energy generated and distributed by the plantations.

Electric rates are believed nominal and to compare favorably with the rates in comparable mainland communities particularly when it is considered that the source of most energy is imported fuel oil and that the various companies have to provide their own standby, interconnection being impossible. Domestic rates for Honolulu and the island of Oahu are between the middle and two-thirds points for cities over 50,000 as they are listed from low to high in the FPC Survey for 1944, and parallel such cities as Evanston, Ill.; Oklahoma City, Okla.; Savannah, Ga.; Chester, Pa.; Rochester, N. Y.; and Fall River, Mass.

Commercial, power and industrial rates of the Hawaiian Electric Co., Ltd., run close to the national average for cities over 50,000 population.

Accounting is done in accordance with systems of accounts prescribed by the commission. Depreciation accruals are ample. The capital structures are free of water. Equity capital has been obtained almost entirely in the Territory in ample amounts. The Hawaiian Electric Co. has recently gone to the mainland for fixed debt capital, the last issue of \$5,000,000 being obtained at 3.03 percent cost to the company.

Rates are subject to what the California commission calls its continuing investigation plan. We have what now amounts to negotiated rate bases that closely approach historical cost less depreciation. If it appears that an earning level has been attained that yields more than a reasonable return, rate reductions are negotiated. If negotiations fail we aim to be ready, willing and able to go into an adversary proceeding.

The last real adversary type of proceeding was in 1936. One, with one of the smaller companies, that was imminent at the outbreak of the war has been resolved. The commission strongly feels that the procedure it has followed has resulted in lower rates becoming more quickly available than by any other procedure, and that at the same time an atmosphere has prevailed that has permitted and encouraged management to further develop utility service in the public interest.

STATEMENT No. 11

(See p. 381)

STATEMENT OF HEATON L. WRENN, PRESIDENT OF THE BAR ASSOCIATION OF HAWAII,
BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE TERRITORIES COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF
REPRESENTATIVES ON THE HAWAII STATEHOOD BILL

A pertinent factor to be considered in determining whether Hawaii is entitled to be admitted into the Union as a State is its ability to govern itself. One of the most relevant inquiries into the question of Hawaii's capacity for self-government is a consideration of the type of legislation that has been passed by its legislature. I submit that Hawaii's legislative record entitles it to serious consideration for statehood. An examination of its legislative record will show that Hawaiian legislation has been progressive, constructive, and intelligent. Hawaiian legislation has kept pace with the times and compares favorably with the legislation passed by our most progressive states.

COMMON LAW IN HAWAII

Before passing to a consideration of Hawaii's legislative background it is in order for me to point out to you that Hawaii was early appreciative of the benefits of the system of common law. In an act to organize the judiciary department of the Hawaiian Islands, passed in 1847, during the reign of Kamehameha III, it was provided: "The reasonings and analogies of the common law, and of the civil law, may in like manner be cited and adopted by any such court, so far as they are deemed to be founded in justice, and not at conflict with the laws and usages of this kingdom. The principles sustained by said courts when sanctioned by the supreme court, shall become incorporated with the common law of the Hawaiian Islands, and shall form an essential ingredient in the civil code."

In 1892 the legislature of the kingdom provided that the common law of England as ascertained by English and American decisions, shall be the common law of Hawaii. This provision, with slight modification, has been carried on into the Revised Laws of Hawaii and by statute today it is provided: "The common law of England as ascertained by English and American decisions, is declared to be the common law of the Territory of Hawaii in all cases except as otherwise expressly provided by the Constitution or laws of the United States or by the laws of the Territory or fixed by Hawaiian judicial precedent or established by Hawaiian usage; provided, however, that no person shall be subject to criminal proceedings except as provided by the written laws of the United States or of the Territory" (1 R. L. Haw. 1945).

HAWAII'S LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

One of the reasons why Hawaiian legislation has been on a high plane, from an over-all point of view, is because of the legislative background of the Hawaiian Islands. As you have undoubtedly already been told, Hawaii was an independent government at the time it was made a Territory of the United States. Hawaii had at that time come into a full realization of its legislative responsibilities.

The Hawaiian Government was organized into a modern constitutional monarchy with the constitution of 1840 during the reign of Kamehameha III. In the year 1847 the legislature had passed organic acts dividing the Government in five departments—that is, into the departments of interior, foreign relations, finance, public instruction and law, each presided over by a minister appointed by the King. In 1852 the constitution was liberalized so as to give the people a proper share in the making of laws and in administering the nation's business. Under the monarchy there were two houses known as the house of nobles appointed by the King, and the legislative assembly elected by the people.

On January 17, 1893, Queen Liliuokalani was overthrown by the provisional government of Hawaii. The Republic of Hawaii was organized and proclaimed on July 4, 1894.

Under the Republic of Hawaii the legislature consisted of two houses styled the senate and house of representatives who were elected by the people.

In 1898 a joint resolution of annexation was passed by both Houses of Congress and signed by President McKinley. On August 12, 1898, the transfer of sovereignty from the Republic of Hawaii to the United States took place.

The organic act, which became effective June 14, 1900, set up a bicameral legislature consisting of a senate and house of representatives of 15 and 30 members, respectively, to be elected by the people. Such a legislature was of course nothing new for Hawaii—it had long been accustomed to a legislature which passed acts governing its people. The organic act continued in force many of the statutes which were in effect during the Republic, subject to modification by Congress or by the legislature.

Having full confidence in the ability of the Hawaiian people to legislate for themselves, Congress in section 55 of the organic act provided "That the legislative power of the Territory shall extend to all rightful subjects of legislation not inconsistent with the Constitution and laws of the United States locally applicable."

From the early training of the people of Hawaii they were able to take their legislative responsibility in stride—they did not have to begin from scratch. They had the background at the very inception of territoryhood to progress from that time on in the same way as the legislatures of the several States who were then members of the Union.

There have been 23 Hawaiian Territorial Legislatures the first of which convened in 1901 and the last in 1945. Beginning in 1905 and every 10 years thereafter Hawaii has printed a complete revision of its revised laws. I am not going to attempt to tell you about all of the legislation that was passed by all of the legislatures, nor am I going to seek to analyze the legislation to which I shall refer—that would not be helpful to you. What I shall try to do is point out the type of legislation that has become law which indicates its progressiveness and demonstrates that our legislatures have an appreciation of legislative responsibility.

I am not for a moment suggesting that the legislation to which I refer is perfect, that it satisfies everyone, or that the bar or I personally endorse it all.

COMMISSIONS

In the field of administrative law the legislature has provided for a number of commissions some of which have done commendable work. In all cases the members of the commissions serve without pay except full time members or persons who are otherwise employees of the Territory or of one of its subdivisions.

The board of water supply of the city and county of Honolulu has done an outstanding job. It consists of seven members, five of whom are appointed by the mayor with the approval of the board of supervisors. The duty of this Board is to manage, control and operate the water properties of the city and county of Honolulu. (See secs. 6841-6875 R. L. Haw. 1945.)

The legislature in an effort to take police affairs out of politics and put the department on a basis of maximum efficiency established a police commission for Honolulu in 1935 (ch. 135 R. L. Haw. 1945). The 1943 legislature created police commissions for each of the several counties of the Territory, the members of which serve without pay and are appointed by the Governor with the approval of the senate.

In 1939 the legislature created a city planning commission for the city and county of Honolulu (sec. 6633 R. L. Haw. 1945). This took the place of a planning commission that had been appointed pursuant to authority granted it by the legislature in 1923. The city planning commission has general supervision of the physical development of the city and county of Honolulu, particularly with respect to real estate, subdivisions, zoning, and master planning.

In 1945 the legislature converted the former parks commission of the city and county of Honolulu into a commission known as the board of public parks and recreation which is in charge of parks, recreation grounds, and playgrounds and has authority over the trimming and removal of shade trees, hedges, and shrubs growing on public streets. (See Act 237 S. L. 1945.)

The public utilities commission has supervision of all public utilities in the Territory of Hawaii. It is appointed by the Governor with the approval of the senate.

The board of harbor commissioners was created by the legislature in 1911. Congress in 1916 amended section 106 of the organic act to provide that the board "shall have and exercise all the powers and shall perform all the duties which may lawfully be exercised by or under the Territory of Hawaii relative to the control and management of the shores, shore waters, navigable streams, harbors" and to the wharves belonging to the Territory.

In addition thereto there is the Hawaiian Homes Commission, the Territorial board of health, (and several commissions to which I shall hereinafter refer, to handle the various departments of government. The handling of many of the functions of government in the Territory by commissions composed of members most of whom do not receive any salary has proven very successful.

UNIFORM LAWS

The Territorial legislature early recognized the importance of passing laws which would be uniform throughout the United States. In 1911 it passed an act creating a commission for the Territory to promote uniformity of legislation in the United States, the commission to be appointed by the Governor with the approval of the senate. (Sec. 35 R. L. Haw. 1945). Uniform Laws which have been adopted by Hawaii are as follows:

1. Aeronautics (ch. 87 R. L. Haw. 1945, L. 1923).
2. Automobile liability security (ch. 140 R. L. Haw. 1945-1933).
3. Business records as evidence (Sec. 9902 R. L. Haw. 1945-1941).
4. Criminal extradition (ch. 225 R. L. Haw. 1945-1941).
5. Extradition of persons of unsound mind (ch. 66 R. L. Haw. 1945-1927).
6. Federal tax lien registration (ch. 311 R. L. Haw. 1945-1931).
7. Foreign executed wills (sec. 12176 R. L. Haw. 1945-1929).
8. Judicial notice of foreign law (ch. 200 R. L. Haw. 1945-1941).
9. Joint obligations (ch. 168 R. L. Haw. 1945-1941).
10. Joint tort-feasors contribution (sec. 10487, et seq. H. L. Haw. 1945-1941).
11. Limited partnership (sec. 8613, et seq. R. L. Haw. 1945-1943).
12. Negotiable instruments (ch. 173 R. L. Haw. 1945-1907).
13. Proof of statutes (sec. 9885 R. L. Haw. 1945-1927)?

14. Sale of securities (ch. 174 R. L. Haw. 1945—1931).
15. Sales (ch. 177 R. L. Haw. 1945—1929).
16. Simultaneous death (ch. 293 R. L. Haw. 1945—1941).
17. Narcotic drugs (ch. 49 R. L. Haw. 1945—1931).
18. Vendor and purchaser risk (ch. 178 R. L. Haw. 1945—1941).
19. Workmen's compensation (ch. 77 R. L. Haw. 1945—1915).
20. Uniform Fiduciaries Act (Act 197 S. L. 1945).

CIVIL SERVICE AND CLASSIFICATION

In 1939 the legislature passed a civil-service law for employees of the Territory, the city and county of Honolulu, and the counties of Kauai, Maui, and Hawaii. The act provides for separate civil-service commissions for each of the Territory and its several subdivisions and provides that the employees of each of such units of government are subject to the Civil Service Commission unless within some of the specified exceptions or are specifically excepted by other statutes (ch. 2 R. L. Haw. 1945).

In 1941 the legislature passed a classification law for the Territory and for the city and county of Honolulu and for each of the counties of the Territory (ch. 3 R. L. Haw. 1945).

TERRITORIAL RETIREMENT SYSTEM

In 1925 the legislature established a retirement system whose members include all persons who are employees of the Territory or of any county, except those which are specifically excluded under the provisions of the act (ch. 15 R. L. Haw. 1945).

PUBLIC HEALTH

In the field of public health the legislature has passed progressive legislation. Section 97 of the organic act continued the Hawaiian health laws, subject to Federal quarantine laws. The Board of Health of the Territory of Hawaii has general charge, oversight and care of the health and lives of the people of the Territory (ch. 35 R. L. Haw. 1945).

In 1939 the legislature passed the Crippled Children's Act which declares that it is the public policy of the Territory to develop, extend, and improve services for locating children who are crippled or who are suffering from conditions which lead to crippling and to provide for medical, surgical, corrective, and other services and care, and facilities for diagnosis, hospitalization, and after-care for such children. The board of health is designated as the agency of the Territory to administer a program of services for children who are crippled or who are suffering from conditions which lead to crippling. The board of health is given power to prepare plans which among other matters shall include financial participation by the Territory in the funds appropriated by the Congress of the United States under title V of the Social Security Act (ch. 38 R. L. Haw. 1945).

In 1939 the legislature created a mental hygiene bureau under the general jurisdiction of the board of health. This bureau is in charge of a director who is a duly licensed doctor of medicine of the Territory, and certified as a psychiatrist by the American Board of Psychiatry and Neurology, Inc. The board has the powers, duties, and functions among others of fostering and promoting a program to acquaint the public with the principles of mental hygiene and for the prevention of mental illness and to conduct an in-patient and out-patient mental hygiene clinic for the examination, study, diagnosis, and treatment of cases of mental illness (ch. 47 R. L. Haw. 1945).

The Uniform Narcotic Drugs Act, adopted by the legislature in 1931 (ch. 49 R. L. Haw. 1945) makes it unlawful for any person to produce, manufacture, possess, have under his control, sell, prescribe, administer, dispense, or compound any habit-forming drug, except as provided in the act.

Hawaii has adopted progressive legislation with respect to protecting the birth records of adopted children and children born out of wedlock, which while fully recording the data with respect to the births of said children, prevent access to said records where their examination is not necessary or is not required for other than a proper purpose (secs. 3112 and 3116 R. L. Haw. 1945).

In 1945 the legislature passed an act providing for compulsory vaccination against small pox, typhoid and paratyphoid fevers, and diphtheria (act 171 S. L. 1945).

HOUSING

In 1935 the legislature passed three bills—one creating the Hawaii Housing Authority (ch. 61 R. L. Haw. 1945) authorizing the authority to borrow money or accept grants from the Federal Government for or in aid of any housing project which such authority is authorized to undertake and to take over any land acquired by the Federal Government for the construction or operation of a housing project or to take over, lease, or manage, any housing project constructed or owned by the Federal Government. The Federal Housing Projects Act (ch. 62 R. L. Haw. 1945) authorizes the United States and any corporation which is an agency of the United States or which is authorized to expend Federal funds to acquire by eminent domain such property as it may deem necessary or convenient for a housing project. An act entitled "Government Aid for Housing Projects" (ch. 63 R. L. Haw. 1945) has for its purpose and intent that the Territory and its political subdivisions and agencies shall cooperate and do all things necessary to aid in the planning, construction, and operation of housing projects under the authority of the United States.

INSTITUTIONS

In an effort to streamline the management of the several public institutions of the Territory, such as the home for the feeble minded, the Territorial hospital, the industrial training schools for boys and girls, the Oahu prison and other Territorial prisons, the legislature, in 1939, created a department of institutions of the Territory (ch. 64 R. L. Haw. 1945). This department operates the institutions above referred to.

LABOR

In the field of labor the Territorial legislature has passed a number of bills during the past 5 or 6 years. In 1939 it created a department of labor and labor relations under the direction and control of a commission of labor and industrial relations (ch. 71 R. L. of Haw. 1945). The director of labor and industrial relations is the chief administrative officer of the department. The bureaus which are under the jurisdiction of the department of labor are: (1) Bureau of unemployment compensation; (2) bureau of workmen's compensation; (3) bureau of research and statistics; (4) bureau of labor law enforcement.

The commission of labor and industrial relations has the duty to make rules and regulations of general application for the protection of life, health, and safety of employees in every employment or place of employment. The act sets up an appeal board of three members which considers all appeals submitted to it from the decisions of the director, including those involving rules and regulations of the commission, except that no mediation matters involving mediation, arbitration, or conciliation of industrial disputes may be considered by the appeal board. The department of labor is required to promote the voluntary mediation of disputes between employers and employees so as to avoid the necessity of resorting to lock-outs, boycotts, black lists, strikes, discriminations, and legal proceedings in matters of employment. It is also required to enforce child-labor laws and other labor laws enacted by the legislature. The commission is directed to assist and cooperate with the Wage and Hour Division of the United States Department of Labor and the Chief of the Children's Bureau in the Department of Labor, in the enforcement within the Territory of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938.

In 1939 the legislature passed a child labor law (sec. 4121 R. L. Haw. 1945) which was substantially amended by Act 9 S. L. 1945. This act regulates the occupations minors may engage in, provides the minimum ages at which minors are permitted to work, the hours permitted to work per day and week, and the continuity of hours of work.

In 1941 the legislature passed an Apprenticeship Act (ch. 72 R. L. Haw. 1945) providing for an apprenticeship board which under the supervision of the director of labor and industrial relations is required to establish standards of apprenticeship agreements and to prescribe rules and regulations with reference thereto. The act only applies to employers who voluntarily elect to conform with its provisions. The apprenticeship board is authorized to promote the administration of the chapter by cooperating with the Federal commission on apprenticeship.

In 1941 the legislature passed an act with respect to labor disputes between employees and public utilities (ch. 73 R. L. Haw. 1945) which has as its aim

the prompt and orderly settlement of labor disputes affecting such public utilities.

In 1915 the legislature adopted a Workmen's Compensation Act (ch. 77 R. L. Haw. 1945) which applies to all industrial employment and provides that if a workman covered by the act shall receive personal injury by accident arising out of and in the course of his employment or by disease proximately caused by the employment, or resulting from the nature of the employment, the employer or the insurance carrier shall pay compensation in the amounts and to the person or persons provided for in the act. The right to compensation under the chapter excludes all other rights and remedies of employees. It provides for security for payment of compensation by insurance or by deposit with the Territorial treasurer.

The Hawaii unemployment compensation law, adopted in 1939 (Ch. 74 R. L. Haw. 1945) like the unemployment compensation laws of the various States, provides for benefit payments in cases of unemployment. Employees covered by the law are in general the same as those covered by the unemployment compensation provisions of the Federal Social Security Act. The principal differences are that the Hawaii law does not contain any exclusion based on temporary employment whereas the Federal provisions are not applicable unless employment continues for 20 weeks and that the Hawaii law is applicable to employees of one or more whereas the Federal provisions are applicable only to employees of eight or more. In addition, employees of charitable organizations are covered by the Hawaii law whereas they are not covered by the Federal provisions.

The weekly benefits range from \$5 to \$25. Benefits are paid during a uniform period of 20 weeks, assuming the continuance of unemployment. The maximum benefits range from \$100 to \$500. The Hawaii formula for the determination of benefits paid, with reference to the weekly benefit amount, the maximum benefits and the amounts of qualifying wages, is one of the most liberal in the United States.

The benefits are paid from a fund which is made up from contributions of employers. The basic contribution rate is 2.7 percent, as contemplated by the Federal provisions. The Hawaii law provides for reductions in the basic contribution rate based on the unemployment experience of the several employers.

Despite the liberality of the benefit payments the Hawaii fund is in an extremely strong financial position.

The 1945 legislature adopted the Employment Relations Act sometimes called the Little Wagner Act, to cover those employees not covered by the Federal Act. The legislation is patterned in general after the Federal act (Act 250 S. L. 1945). The act establishes a Hawaii Employment Relations Board and a conciliator and makes it the duty of the board and of the conciliator to cooperate with the National Labor Relations Board and its agents and representatives. Under the act the term "employee" includes any person, other than an independent contractor, working for another for hire in the Territory but excludes domestic employees, persons engaged directly in the milking or feeding of milch cows, or any individual employed by an employer employing less than eight individuals or any individual subject to the Federal Railway Labor Act or the National Labor Relations Act. The act spells out unfair labor practices for employers as well as employees.

Hawaii adopted a wage and hour law in 1941 (ch. 75 R. L. Haw. 1945). The law was substantially amended in 1945 (Act 15 S. L. 1945). Its principal significance is that it supplements the Federal wage and hour law in that it is applicable generally to employees who are not engaged in commerce or the production of goods for commerce. Furthermore, it is specifically applicable to agricultural employees who are exempt from the Federal law. The Hawaii law provides for a minimum wage of 40 cents per hour and provides for overtime at time and a half for hours in excess of 48 in any week. In the administration of the chapter the commission and the director are required to cooperate with the Administrator of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

FARM LOANS

In 1919 the legislature established a Farm Loan Board of Hawaii with authority to make loans secured by first mortgages on farm lands (ch. 18 R. L. Haw. 1945). The farm loan board under certain conditions is authorized to accept Home Owners' Loan corporation bonds in payment of principal and interest on loans.

PUBLIC WELFARE

In 1941 the legislature established a department of public welfare (ch. 85 R. L. Haw. 1945) which department among other things is required to supervise the administration of all public assistance, old age assistance, aid to dependent children, aid to the blind and child welfare activities.

LAND COURT

In 1903 the legislature by Act 56 established a system of registration of titles to land and of conveyancing by registration. The Hawaiian act is designed to create a system of dealing with land which is simple, rapid, inexpensive, and secure. To this end a government registry is established which consists of a number of certificates of title bound together, which certificates contain the following information: The person in whose name the land is registered, a description of the land the title to which is registered and a summary of encumbrances to which the land is subject, if any. The Hawaiian act is almost a carbon copy of the Massachusetts statute. Similar acts as known as Torrens Title Acts on the mainland.

Hawaii also has an excellent and simple system of registration of conveyances.

PUBLIC WORKS

In 1929 the legislature passed the Federal Aid Highways Act (ch. 89, R. L. Haw. 1945) to comply with the provisions of the Federal Highways Act (23 U. S. Code, 1).

In 1937 the legislature established a Territorial planning board of nine members (ch. 93, R. L. Haw. 1945) whose duty it is to prepare and perfect from time to time a Territorial master plan for the physical development of the Territory and to prepare and keep current a proposed long term development program of major Territorial improvements.

TAXATION

In the field of taxation Hawaii has been outstandingly progressive in its effort to cover all possible fields. The Territorial Income Tax Act (originally Act 20, S. L. 1901) has been in force since July 1, 1901. The present income-tax law has a provision for a graduated tax with provision for current payment and withholding.

It has real property taxes, personal-property taxes on all personal property used in a trade or business, and a gross income tax. It also has a consumption tax, an inheritance tax, an estate tax, a public-utility tax, franchise taxes and miscellaneous liquor, tobacco, fuel and weight taxes.

ACTIONS

Although Hawaii preserves the distinction between equity and common-law actions, much of the archaic common-law procedure has been abandoned, as for instance, the statutory requirement that the responsive pleading to a complaint be either an answer or a demurrer. We also have statutory forms of pleading the customary causes of action on liquidation and unliquidated claims which set forth a greatly simplified form of action (sec. 1031, et seq., R. L. Haw. 1945).

As early as 1921 the Territorial Legislature passed a declaratory judgment statute (ch. 202, R. L. Haw. 1945; Act 74, S. L. 1945) which provides for the granting of relief in cases where ordinary legal remedies are inadequate.

Since 1876 Hawaii has had statutory provisions for the revival of actions in case of death of either party (sec. 10080, et seq., R. L. Haw. 1945).

In 1923 the legislature adopted a wrongful death act providing for suit by the dependents of persons killed through the negligence of another (sec. 10486, R. L. Haw. 1945).

ADOPTION

The 1945 legislature adopted certain improvements on the procedure for adoption to insure that the adoption would be for the best interests of the child and setting up what might be called an interlocutory period during which an investigation can be made. This act also provides for secrecy of adoption records (Act 40, S. L. 1945).

ABSENTEES

Our 1945 legislature adopted an act for the admission of the written findings of death made by the Secretaries of War and Navy pursuant to the Federal Missing Persons Act in order to prove the death of missing persons (Act 148, S. L. 1945).

WAR EMERGENCY

In the spring of 1941 Hawaii's Legislature passed the Hawaii Defense Act (ch. 324, R. L. Haw. 1945; Act 275 S. L. 1945). This act declared a public emergency and gave the Governor comprehensive powers to deal with problems arising during the defense period. The Governor on December 7, 1941, declared a defense period under the act and during the defense period has exercised the extraordinary powers given him under the act in meeting existing problems.

AIRPORTS

The 1945 legislature adopted legislation patterned on the legislation recommended by the Federal Aeronautics Commission, known as the Airport Zoning Act, for improving approaches to airports. This act qualifies the Territory to receive Federal aid in connection with its airports (Act 182, S. L. 1945).

BANKS AND BANKING

Our legislation on banks and banking sets up a rigid control and system of examination by the Territorial Treasurer to safeguard depositors, etc. (sec. 6501, et seq., R. L. Haw. 1945).

BREAD

The 1945 legislature adopted an act requiring the enrichment of flour by the addition of vitamins and minerals. (Act 101, S. L. 1945.)

BLUE-SKY LAW

The Territory has had for many years adequate provisions to prevent the sale locally of stock without complying with the Territorial blue-sky law. The legislation follows the pattern laid down by the Uniform Sale of Securities Act. (Ch. 174, R. L. Haw. 1945.)

COMMUNITY PROPERTY LAW

A community property law was enacted at the 1945 session of the Hawaii Legislature (Act 273, S. L. 1945). This law in general is patterned on community property laws heretofore in effect in eight of the Western and Southern States of the United States. Under the law the earnings of a husband and the earnings of a wife and the income from property owned by each all constitutes community income so that the husband has a vested interest in half of all such income and the wife has a vested interest in the other half of all such income. This is progressive legislation in that it substantially improves the legal position of a wife with respect to property interests. The law has been approved by the Bureau of Internal Revenue as effective for Federal income-tax purposes.

CORPORATIONS

In addition to the customary statutes on corporations Hawaii has provisions protecting minority stockholders from unwarranted action by a majority, such as the act preventing a sale of all of the corporate property without the consent of at least three-quarters of the stockholders (Sec. 8343, R. L. Haw. 1945); cumulative voting (Act 228, S. L. 1945). Laws restricting the doing of business by foreign corporations are not unduly strict.

DIVORCE

Hawaii has fairly liberal divorce laws but a strict residence requirement of 2 years.

FIDUCIARIES

Hawaii has considerable legislation restricting the type of investments to be made by trustees, guardians, etc. Trust companies are regulated by the Territorial Treasurer to avoid loss to investors and beneficiaries.

INSURANCE

Hawaii has a complete insurance code very similar to that under consideration by the Committee on Uniform Legislation of the American Bar Association.

LANDLORD AND TENANT

Hawaii has adopted legislation and enabling acts for the passage of ordinances to protect tenants and regulate landlords during the current housing shortage, both in connection with residence rent control and commercial rent control.

Hawaii instituted an elaborate system of commercial rent control during the war and I am informed today is the only jurisdiction except New York to have such a system.

LIENS

Hawaii has adequate legislation to protect laborers and materialmen, providing for the filing of mechanic's liens.

MARRIAGE

Common-law marriages are not recognized in Hawaii. Marriage by relatives is prohibited. Marriage of females under 16 and males under 18 is prohibited. Persons under 20 must secure the consent of their parents, guardian, or other person having the care of the minor. The 1945 legislature passed an act requiring a premarital examination for syphilis. (Act 136, S. L. 1945.)

MARRIED WOMEN

Hawaii has forward-looking legislation permitting a wife to own and manage her own property, and to contract in certain cases, including the right to enter into a partnership with her husband.

PARTNERSHIPS

Hawaii has statutes regulating the doing of business as a partnership and has the Uniform Limited Partnership Act.

CONCLUSION

Of necessity the foregoing summary is incomplete; it has been possible to touch only the highlights of the legislation appearing on the statute books.

It is submitted that from an over-all point of view Hawaiian legislation compares favorably with the legislation passed by the legislatures of our most progressive States and that it is progressive, constructive and intelligent. Hawaii's legislative record is cogent and irresistible evidence of its ability to govern itself.

STATEMENT No. 12

(See p. 392)

PUBLIC EDUCATION IN HAWAII AND STATEHOOD

(By Benjamin O. Wist, dean, Teachers College, University of Hawaii)

Hawaii's readiness for statehood is, in part, contingent upon the extent and quality of provisions for public education. Briefly summarized, herewith, are some of the factors which justify the conclusion that (as far as public education is concerned) Hawaii is entitled to statehood.

1. *Historical.*—Hawaii's system of public education is older than that of a majority of the Western States (established in 1840). Public education was initiated and organized by American missionaries, contemporaries of Horace Mann. During the period of monarchy, public education became increasingly American in structure, curriculum emphasis, and language. English was the legal medium of instruction before annexation. The American character of public education was advanced as an argument for annexation. The congressional commission recommended, "that the present school system remain in force * * * No system could be adopted which would tend to Americanize the people more thoroughly than this." Throughout the period of Territorial government, Hawaii's program of public education has developed in harmony with American trends.

2. *Control, organization, support.*—Hawaii's public-school program is controlled in the typical American practice by a lay board, operating under local legislative enactments. Hawaii's Organic Act includes very few stipulations with reference to public education. In organization, Hawaii has achieved what many States are striving for: Centralization of control. Only one State (Delaware) has comparable State-wide control. This centralization has brought about better equalization of educational opportunity than exists in any of the 48 States. Hawaii has only ten 1-teacher schools in a total of 190 public schools. All other rural schools are consolidated. Rural schools compare favorably with urban schools in quality of teachers, physical plant facilities, equipment, length of school term and other factors. Urban schools and some rural schools are organized on the 6-3-3 plan (elementary, junior high, and senior high school). Other rural schools are organized on the 8-4 plan. The percentage of high-school pupils in the total enrollment is approximately 25 percent of the total. Twelve years of schooling is the normal expectation of every child. The people of Hawaii support their own public-school system as do the people in the States. This support has been generous. It is in excess of the national median for the States. Hawaii benefits, as do the States, from Federal subvention grants, e. g., Smith-Hughes grants.

3. *Teachers' qualifications, salaries.*—Hawaii's standard for teacher certification is 5 years of college preparation. No State has comparable standards. When established in 1933, this standard was not made retroactive; but by this time more than one-third of the public-school teachers have attained such background. Another third have degrees. A single-salary schedule is operative. The first grade teacher, of comparable training and experience, is paid as much as the high-school teacher. The schedule compares favorably with the States. Hawaii's teachers are representative of the various ethnic groups that make up Hawaii's population. The following is a rough break-down by racial extraction, for the years 1940-41 and 1944-45.

	1940-41		1944-45	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Hawaiian.....	319	10.00	271	8.0
Haole.....	1,196	37.00	1,187	38.0
Portuguese.....	233	7.00	233	7.0
Chinese.....	600	18.00	468	15.0
Japanese.....	755	23.00	932	30.0
Korean.....	62	2.00	26	.8
Filipino.....	2	.06	6	.1
Others.....	13	.04	9	.2
Total.....	3,180	98.00	3,106	99.0

A considerable number of locally born teachers have had a year or more of mainland educational experience. Many others have had summer travel or schooling on the mainland. There has never been any question about the loyalty or ideals of Hawaii's public-school teachers by those acquainted with them. Their military and other war service response has more than justified expectations.

4. *Teacher education.*—Teacher education provisions compare favorably with mainland practice. A 5-year program of preparation is provided in Teachers College, University of Hawaii. Students selected for teacher training are among the best graduates of the public and private high schools. Objective

test results place Teachers College students on a par with mainland liberal arts college students in general culture background. Their program of teacher preparation emphasizes (a) general education, (b) the practices of American democracy, (c) professional courses in theory and practice, and (d) more emphasis upon English (composition, speech, literature) than any other American teacher-training institution. The quality of their service as graduates compares favorably, on any criterion, with graduates of mainland universities and colleges.

5. *Higher education.*—The University of Hawaii is typical of State universities, except for size. It is controlled in the typical American practice by a board of regents. It operates under local legislative appropriations, student fees, and Federal grants in the same manner as do State universities. The University of Hawaii is a member of the Association of American Universities. Its scholarship standards are comparable to other first-class American institutions of higher learning.

6. *Citizenship.*—Public schools and the university have stressed American citizenship in curriculum practices. The results are self-evident. Hawaii's political, professional and business leaders are, in no small percentage, the graduates of our public schools. The inter-racial tolerance so characteristic of Hawaii is, in no small measure, the result of the citizenship emphasis in the public school program. It is no accident that, when American citizens of Japanese ancestry were authorized to volunteer for military service and a quota of 1,500 was allotted, nearly 10,000 volunteered. Less than one-half of 1 percent of the public school enrollment are foreign born.

7. *Language usage.*—Hawaii has a language problem. In this, it is not unique among American communities. Brooklyn has its inimitable jargon, Alabama its delightful inflection, New Mexico its foreign language speaking population. Hawaii, too, has its patois or "pidgin", which while distinctive is becoming more and more English in character. It is not being eradicated, but it is becoming a second language as the quality of English, as such, becomes better. As a matter of fact, there are virtually no citizens of Hawaii who do not use English.

8. *Public education under statehood.*—Statehood will enhance the quality of American public education in Hawaii.

(a) The control and support now borne by the people of Hawaii is by virtue of congressional tolerance. Congress could, by amendment of the organic act, take away from the people of Hawaii their control of public education.

(b) In general, Hawaii is proud of its achievement in the promotion and development of public education in the American pattern—even by proxy. Under statehood, this pride would be greatly stimulated.

(c) Any tendencies toward "educational in-breeding" now existing would be greatly reduced under statehood. There would be greater mobility among teachers. Exchange of teachers would be facilitated. More Hawaiian-born students would seek mainland educational experience, and conversely, more students from the mainland would seek education in Hawaii because there would be greater reciprocity possible between Hawaii (as a State) and other States than is now possible between Hawaii (as a Territory) and the 48 States.

(d) By providing educational leadership Hawaii can make significant contribution to the dissemination of the democratic way of life throughout the vast Pacific area. It has the experience to draw upon. Such service would be greatly enhanced under the prestige of statehood.

STATEMENT NO. 13

(See p. 393)

PUBLIC SCHOOL EDUCATION IN RELATION OF STATEHOOD

(By Oren E. Long, department of public instruction, Territory of Hawaii)

The United States depends primarily upon one organized instrument to develop an intelligent and informed citizenry. This instrument is the public school.

Support of the public schools in Hawaii has been based on a conviction that the chief function of tax-supported education is to produce good citizens. This means the ability to earn a living; to supply the needs of one's self and of

dependents; to be a good home builder and a good neighbor; to cooperate with others in carrying on the work of all organized agencies, including the various functions of government.

There are evidences that these objectives are being realized in Hawaii to a degree comparable to the success attained in mainland school systems.

In support of this assertion, the following statements are submitted:

1. ORGANIZATION

In organization, the schools of Hawaii are unique in that control is vested in a single school board of eight members, called the commission of public instruction. This board is responsible for all phases of the program of the 184 public schools situated on the seven inhabited islands.

The authority and duties of the school board are set forth in the following quotations from the Revised Laws of Hawaii, 1945:

"SEC. 1701. There shall be an executive department to be known as the department of public instruction. The commissioners, hereafter provided for, shall have full authority and responsibility for the administration of the department of public instruction and all matters pertaining thereto, and shall state the policy or policies of education in the Territory, and fix the curriculum for all the schools under their control. They shall prescribe the duties of the superintendent of public instruction, who shall be administrative officer."

"SEC. 1702. The governor, in the manner prescribed in section 80 of the Organic Act, shall appoint a board of eight commissioners. All commissioners shall have been citizens of the Territory for at least 5 years next preceding their appointment. The commission shall be composed of two appointees who are residents of the county of Hawaii, one of the county of Maui, one of the county of Kauai, two of the city and county of Honolulu and one who shall be appointed at large, who shall be the chairman. Three of the commissioners shall be appointed for a term of 2 years, and four shall be appointed for a period of 4 years. The superintendent of public instruction shall be a member ex-officio on full parity with the other members. Upon the expiration of the terms of the members, their respective successors shall be respectively appointed for a term of 4 years. In case of a vacancy occurring through any cause other than the expiration of the term of office, such vacancy shall be filled by the appointment of a succeeding member for the remainder of the term for which his predecessor was appointed."

"SEC. 1822. The department shall have entire charge and control and be responsible for the conduct of all affairs pertaining to public instruction. The department is authorized to establish and maintain schools for secular instruction at such places and for such terms as in its discretion it may deem advisable and the funds at its disposal may permit. The department shall regulate the course of study to be pursued in all grades of public schools and classify them by such methods as it shall deem proper. Such schools may include normal schools, high schools, kindergarten schools, schools for technical instruction, boarding schools, evening as well as day schools. * * *

(NOTE.—All laws pertaining to the public schools appear under Title 5: Education, Revised Laws of Hawaii, 1945, pp. 264 to 285. The most important of these laws appears in the "School Code" published in 1945, pp. 5 to 40. A copy of this is shown in "Exhibit 62A.")

2. EQUALITY OF EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY

The centralized control referred to above has enabled Hawaii, more nearly than any one of the 48 States, to attain in actual practice one of the basic considerations in a democracy, namely: Equality of educational opportunity. Children living in rural communities have the same educational opportunities provided for city children. The length of the school year is the same throughout the Territory; certification requirements for teachers are the same; one salary schedule applies to all; expenditures per pupil for educational supply and equipment items are the same; library service is the same; the same emphasis is given to basic subject-matter materials; courses in vocational education are on the same basis; much the same type of instruction is offered in such appreciation subjects as music and elementary art.

During the past decade, new senior high schools have been established in 12 rural communities, thus making it possible for practically all children to attend high school without living away from home or traveling long distances.

This situation does not obtain in the mainland States. All too frequently school boards in cities and in localities where there is a concentration of wealth pay higher salaries than can be paid in rural areas. These more favored communities can attract a disproportionate percentage of superior teachers; they provide more educational supply and equipment items and more school services; their school year is approximately 15 days longer.

President Roosevelt's Advisory Committee on Education, appointed in 1935, issued a report in 1938. They stated that one of the tragic conditions in the present school situation is the contrast between the educational opportunity provided for city youth and for the youth of the rural communities. The following is quoted from that report:

"In general, the least satisfactory schools are found in the rural areas. Although rural schools have improved steadily, there is a wide gap between country and city levels of educational service. Under present conditions, there is no prospect that the rural areas will be able to lessen this gap through their own resources.

"Low school expenditures in rural areas have unfortunate results for the children. Since the teachers are poorly paid, they are frequently untrained and inexperienced. They usually follow textbooks and make little use of supplementary materials to give vitality and interest to their teaching. School terms average a month shorter than in cities. The health, welfare, guidance and other services that school children need in addition to instruction are almost universally lacking."

As has already been stated, this situation does not apply to Hawaii. By and large, the children of the most remote rural communities have educational opportunities comparable to those provided for city children.

3. FINANCIAL SUPPORT

One of the important criteria for measuring sufficiency of a public-school program is adequacy of financial support, particularly in relation to the program of instruction. In this respect, Hawaii ranks high. The latest figures available for the continental United States are for the school year 1941-42 and are contained in United States Office of Education Circular No. 231 (1945). For that year, the average annual salary per teacher in Hawaii (combined rural and urban schools) was approximately the same as that for the average of mainland city school systems and almost twice as much as the average for mainland rural schools.

The average for United States urban schools was \$2,013.00; for United States rural schools, \$1,012.00; for Hawaii schools, \$2,014.00. Only five States—New York, New Jersey, Connecticut, Massachusetts, and California—and the District of Columbia paid an average salary higher than that paid in Hawaii. Since 1942, an increase of \$384 in the basic salary and a bonus of \$540 per year for each teachers in Hawaii have been granted. Data covering mainland increases are not available here.

On the basis of total cost per pupil, exclusive of capital outlay, Hawaii in 1941-42 slightly exceeded the average for continental United States. The total per pupil cost in Hawaii for the school year ended June 30, 1945, was \$114.71. Comparable figures for mainland school systems as of June 1945, are not yet available.

4. CITIZENSHIP AS AN OBJECTIVE

In view of the unusual racial composition of Hawaii's population, the development of sound qualities of citizenship has, for many years, been a primary objective of the public schools.

From the standpoint of imparting information and providing for pupil participation in a wide range of student activities and school organization, there is objective evidence of progress. While it is not so easy to evaluate the more intangible outcomes, such as an understanding of American institutions, the spirit back of these institutions, and a whole-hearted devotion to them—teachers in the schools, social workers in the community and civic leaders generally have strong convictions that unusual progress has been made. Before the war, there was a difference of opinion on this point; but the record of Hawaii's entire population following December 7, 1941, has almost entirely eliminated any honest doubt on this question. The record of Hawaii's young men, who fought on the battle fronts of Europe and of the Pacific area, bear witness to their understanding and devotion.

The following statements in regard to the success of the schools in developing citizenship are significant:

(a). In 1944, the Holdover Committee of the Territorial Legislature requested the American Council on Education to sponsor a study of the curriculum of the public schools. The council selected Dr. Edgar M. Draper, Professor of Secondary Education and Curriculum, University of Washington, as director of this survey. In addition to reviewing the situation in relation to the more traditional subject-matter fields, Dr. Draper and his assistants were vitally concerned with the general socialization of Hawaii's school population and evidences of citizenship growth. His report, submitted to the twenty-third biennial session of the legislature in February 1945, opened with the following paragraph:

"The Territory of Hawaii had convincing evidence in the days which followed December 7, 1941, that its educational program had faced a critical test, and that the objectives and ideals of democratic citizenship had become a part of the lives of a people of many races and backgrounds. Every American citizen owes a debt of gratitude to those people in the Territory who had the vision to plan and to develop a democratic school program. Few other communities can boast of having done so much educationally in such a short period of time."

(b). In 1937, a Joint Committee on Hawaii, composed of Senators and Representatives of the United States Congress, visited Hawaii to conduct a study of its social, political and economic life. They were keenly interested in the educational program and visited a considerable number of schools while assemblies and classroom work were going on. In commenting on the schools in their written report, they said: "The standards of instruction are the same as on the mainland, being higher than those of many States, and are maintained at the same level in both rural and urban areas." They concluded their comments on education as follows:

"The public schools of Hawaii are the foundation of good citizenship. As a part of their curriculum, they inculcate the basic principles of American democracy in the youth who pass through them. With so many children of alien parentage among them, a definite program of Americanization is necessary. Too much praise cannot be given the schools of Hawaii for the splendid manner in which they have met this problem, and in the great measure of success that has attended their efforts. Through the schools, more than by any other means, the people of Hawaii are being molded together into the American pattern and philosophy of life * * *" (p. 91, Statehood for Hawaii, 75th Congress, Document No. 151).

(c) Numerous statements were made following the attack on Pearl Harbor in regard to the morale of the people of Hawaii and the constructive way in which they met the trying situation that developed. These statements are too well known to require repeating. It is felt, however, that the "open letter", issued in January 1942, by Lt. Gen. Delos C. Emmons, United States Army, commanding, should be included in this statement, since it indicates the general quality of citizenship attained by Hawaii's people. (Exhibit 62B.)

As indicated by these statements, there is reliable evidence that desirable qualities of citizenship, in relation to neighborliness, community life and national life, are a characteristic of the people of Hawaii. This development is the joint product of a great many influences, including home, church, industry and organized community agencies. An important influence—possibly the most important influence—has been the organized educational program of Hawaii.

(NOTE.—The extent to which schools participate in meeting community or national needs is the real basis for growth in citizenship. Attitudes and habits of conduct are formed through doing things rather than by studying about things. "Exhibit 62B" gives, in brief, the contribution of Hawaii's schools to the war program.)

5. OVER-ALL PROGRAM OF INSTRUCTION¹

The public schools of Hawaii provide schooling for all children under a compulsory attendance law that requires boys and girls between the ages of 6 and 16 to be enrolled in regular day schools. In addition to the compulsory attendance period, children are enrolled at the age of 5 in public kindergartens. This program is expanding rapidly and will, within a few years, bring this serv-

¹ See Exhibit 62c, a partially completed course of study. Pages 5 to 17a outline briefly the offerings in the fields of social studies—from the kindergarten through the high school. It will be noted that history, geography, health and safety, guidance, and citizenship are stressed. A similar outline of English language development begins on p. 32.

ice to the families in most communities—urban and rural—throughout the Territory.

Also in addition to the compulsory attendance period, the 25 senior high schools of the Territory bring high school graduation within the reach of practically all communities, urban and rural. A very substantial proportion of all students remain in school beyond the compulsory attendance age and complete their high school work. Evening and part-time education for adults, as part of the public-school system, has been made possible by authorization and an appropriation made by the legislature in the spring of 1945. This work with adults is expanding rapidly.

The schools of the territory are, in general, organized as elementary (grades 1 to 6), intermediate (junior high, grades 7 to 9), and senior high (grades 10 to 12). In a number of areas where the population is limited, transportation or other considerations make it advisable that the schools be organized as elementary (grades 1 to 8) and high school (grades 9 to 12).

(a) *Instruction.*—The program of work within the schools is the same as that found in good mainland systems. Emphasis is upon citizenship, and development of the skills and knowledges required for the attainment of fluent English usage. These emphases begin in the kindergarten and are maintained consistently throughout the 13 years to the end of high school.

The 1944 course of study (exhibit 62c) outlines classroom work. Primary grade children have informal work in arithmetic and social studies. More formal work in both of these fields begins at the third grade. The social studies are stressed throughout the remaining years of school. The course of study outlines clearly the learnings in history, geography and civics that are planned and presented each school year. Work in arithmetic is carried on steadily from the third grade through the ninth. Many senior high school students also enroll for algebra, geometry and trigonometry, but only 1 year of mathematics is required during the last 3 years. Many schools provide work in music, art, crafts, prevocational agriculture, homemaking and shop.

The war has affected Hawaii's teaching staff just as it has affected the staffs of mainland systems. In a number of schools, it has been necessary to curtail or eliminate some of the courses listed above because of our inability to obtain competent teachers. Now that the war is over, it is expected that all work of this nature will be reestablished and expanded. It is the purpose of the department: (1) That all children shall have some experience in gardening; (2) that all boys shall have work in prevocational agriculture or shop (preferably both); and (3) that all girls shall have courses in prevocational homemaking. Music and art are made part of elementary school work. The quality of this work will improve as teachers, properly trained, return to service or become available for employment. Nearly all secondary schools offer band, orchestra and chorus as electives, and most of them are able to offer art or aircraft courses under competent leadership.

(b) *School services.*—Certain activities of the schools have been called services, but it should be made clear that they are maintained within the schools because of their high educational value. Some of these services are:

(1) *Cafeterias:* This service not only supplies nutritious, hot lunches to a high percentage of all school children, but provides a cooperative program of work in which children learn many valuable things related to democratic citizenship. Hawaii's work in this field has been nationally recognized as being superior. (For fuller description, see p. 39, exhibit 62D.)

(2) *Dental hygiene:* This program, which provides professional care, also gives fine instruction in the hygiene of the mouth and in nutrition. Every child in grades 1 to 4, in both rural and urban schools, is cared for. (See p. 25, exhibit 62D.)

(3) *Vision testing:* This work is done by teachers in cooperation with the Bureau of Sight Conservation and Work With the Blind. It not only discovers children who need special help, either medical or in the form of glasses, but also helps teachers and pupils to be more sensitive and careful in relation to care of the eyes.

(4) *Hearing testing:* Special workers on the staff of the Territorial School for Deaf and Blind direct and interpret these tests in all schools of the Territory. The present schedule provides for such tests once every 3 years. War curtailed this work sharply, both through difficulty of travel and loss of trained personnel. It has now been reestablished. This testing program not only discovers pupils who have suffered hearing losses and provides for their proper placement, but

also makes all pupils and teachers conscious of the need for care of the ears and prevention of hearing loss.

(5) *Health education*: The physical examination of pupils, immunizations and other medical care may be listed as school service. Health education is much broader and enters into the daily work of the classes. Particular attention is given the needs of crippled and handicapped children. (See p. 23, exhibit 62D.)

6. GROWTH IN THE SCHOOL PROGRAM

The program of the schools in Hawaii is not static. There are evidences that growth has been taking place. Among important developments of the past 12 years are the following:

(a) *Establishment of a single salary schedule*.—Under this plan, teachers in the lower grades are paid the same as teachers in the secondary grades, provided their preparation and experience are the same. Educationally, this is of great significance, since it encourages good teachers with an aptitude and interest in primary grade education to remain on this level rather than to seek placement in the upper grades because of higher rates of compensation. This law was passed in 1941. This is in keeping with mainland trends; from 1934-44, 57 percent of the communities that made changes in teacher salary schedules adopted the single salary schedule type.

(b) *Exchange of teachers*.—In 1935, a law authorizing the exchange of teachers with other school systems was passed. Between that date and the outbreak of the war, Hawaii sent approximately 300 teachers to mainland school systems and received a like number in return.

(c) *Sabbatical leave*.—In 1935, a plan establishing the privilege of sabbatical leave for all teachers who had completed 7 years' service went into effect. Under this plan, a teacher going on leave receives approximately \$90 a month for 12 months. A limited amount of professional training or travel is required.

(d) *Compulsory attendance*.—The age of compulsory attendance has been raised from 14 years to 16 years. (Session Laws of Hawaii, 1937.)

(e) *Kindergartens*.—Kindergartens have recently become a part of the regular public school program. The 1943 session of the legislature provided for the progressive establishment of kindergartens. Additional appropriations for this purpose were made by the 1945 session. The program will be extended until every community in the Territory is served.

(f) *Guidance*.—An occupational information and guidance service was established in 1942 and a pupil guidance division in 1943.

(g) *Adult education*.—Evening classes in vocational education have been offered during a period of 20 years. A program of adult education to include all fields was established in 1945.

(h) *Extension of educational offering*.—In 1935, there were only nine public senior high schools in the Territory. Since that date, 16 have been added. Twelve of these are in rural communities. Children in all parts of the Territory, where there is any considerable number of people, may now attend secondary schools without leaving their home communities.

During this same period, the 9th grade has been added to 30 other schools. The program of vocational training has also been extended, particularly in vocational agriculture and homemaking. A vocational school was also established in Hilo, thus giving each county a vocational school that meets the standards of the George-Deen Act.

(i) *Continuation of the effort to adapt the program to the needs of children and the community*.—This involves a recognition of individual differences and a modification of the program to provide for these differences. Through continuous effort on the part of teachers, progress has been toward this ideal.

7. STATISTICAL TABLES

Significant tables pertaining to the schools of Hawaii are in "Exhibit 12". These contain statements of the cost of education in Hawaii as compared to the costs on the mainland. Enrollment trends over a period of years are also given.

Since there is so much interest in the racial background of the pupils in the public and private schools of Hawaii, special attention is called to Table No. IV, beginning on page 8, which shows that whereas 44.06 percent of all first-grade children in 1934-35 were of Japanese ancestry, the percentage for the school year 1944-45 had fallen to 34.56 percent.

Table No. V, which appears on page 7, shows that out of the total enrollment in the public schools of 81,557 only 190 boys and girls, or 0.23 percent, were foreign born.

8. TOPICS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

There are two topics related to education in Hawaii that are of special interest. These are as follows:

(a) *Oriental language schools*.—At the time of the 1937 statehood hearings, a great deal of attention was given to the oriental language schools, particularly those teaching the Japanese language. All these schools—Chinese, Japanese, Korean—were classed as of December 7, 1941, and were not reopened.

Act 104, passed by the 1943 session of the legislature, was designed to prevent these schools from ever reopening. The following statements are quoted from the Revised Laws of Hawaii, 1945:

"SEC. 1873. Requirements for pupil: No child shall be taught a foreign language in any school unless he shall comply with one of the following requirements: (a) That he shall have passed the fourth grade in public school or its equivalent, and shall pass from time to time in each succeeding grade a standard test in English composition and reading conducted by or under the direction of the department of public instruction attaining a score not lower than normal for his grade; or (b) that he shall have passed the eighth grade in public school or its equivalent; or (c) that he shall have attained the age of 15 years."

"SEC. 1874. Requirements for teacher: No school shall permit the teaching of any foreign language to any child under the age of 15 unless the teacher shall have been examined and certified by a board of examiners of three persons appointed by the commissioners of public instruction to be reasonably well versed in the usage and idiom of both the English language and the foreign language to be taught by such teacher. * * *"

The law is so worded that either public schools or private schools may offer any Oriental language as a modern language. These languages would be offered on the same basis as Spanish, French, German or any other modern language.

It is generally understood that the public schools will offer courses in the Chinese and Japanese language as soon as arrangements can be made and qualified teachers secured. This offering may include Korean, if there is sufficient demand for it. Students will be permitted to select these courses only when they have attained a satisfactory mastery of both oral and written English.

(b) *English-standard schools*.—The establishment of special schools, known as English-standard schools, remains one of the controversial issues in the schools of Hawaii.

These schools were established in 1924 at the request of patrons who did not wish their children's speech to be corrupted by pidgin English. To understand this position, it is necessary to know something about this dialect. The following is quoted from "Hawaii—Off-Shore Territory," by Miss Helen Gay Pratt, published in 1944 by Charles Scribner's Sons:

"'Pidgin' English deserves some description. It has had a long history in the Islands. It developed as a means of communication among people who had no other language in common. It is a language still in common use, so it will be described in the present tense. The street patois of Hawaii is a distinct language by itself. Its vocabulary is almost entirely drawn from the English language, supplemented by the Hawaiian. In its primitive sentence structure, in its lack of verb inflection, and in its omission of articles, it resembles the Japanese language. It is pronounced differently by people of different language backgrounds; for example, the Japanese gives the *r* sound to *l*; the Portuguese the *d* sound to *th*, the *ee* sound to short *i*. These defects are, however, interchangeable, and children of any background readily pick up the errors they hear around them. An almost indescribable voice inflection, of Portuguese origin, characterizes the patois, in which pronouns are wrongly stressed. The language makes almost no use of auxiliary verbs; questions, for example, are indicated only by a rising inflection. The vocabulary is inadequate, primitive and sometimes attaches the wrong meanings as, for example, 'I find for him,' which may mean, 'I shall look for him,' or 'I looked for him,' or 'I am looking for him,' or 'Shall I look for him?'"

This language has a great many variations but, no matter what modifications are made by those who use it, it is wholly inadequate. Its vocabulary is so limited that it cannot be used to express abstract ideas. In no sense can it be called "English."

The dialect or "pidgin" English is basic in the speech problem confronting Hawaii. It has been found that when a great number of children are enrolled in a school, a limited number of whom come from homes where correct speech is used, their influence from the standpoint of speech is not sufficient to neutralize the shortcomings in the speech of others but that, instead, they tend to pick up all sorts of incorrect expressions.

It was to meet this situation that special schools for young children with an English-speaking background were established. It cannot be pointed out too strongly that these schools are not set up on a racial basis. There are a total of eight such schools in the Territory. In some of them, the largest number from any single group are the Hawaiian and Part-Hawaiian. The Chinese have a high percentage in relation to their total enrollment in the schools. The enrollment by groups in the Thomas Jefferson Elementary School (standard) is as follows:

Thomas Jefferson Elementary School

Hawaiian and Part-Hawaiian	170	Korean	4
Portuguese	19	Filipino	8
Spanish	4	All others	36
Other Caucasian	75		
Chinese	48	Total	458
Japanese	94		

The enrollment in the Roosevelt High School (English Standard) is divided as follows:

Hawaiian and Part-Hawaiian	250	Japanese	102
Portuguese	73	Korean	48
Spanish	19	All others	10
Other Caucasian	289		
Chinese	251	Total	1,042

As has already been stated, this is a controversial issue. Everyone in Hawaii, including patrons of these schools, regret the conditions that led to the establishment of these schools 21 years ago. As the quality of speech used in the home improves, it is expected that many children in each regular school will be grouped on the basis of their speech ability. The final step will be the raising of the level of speech of all children so that any speech differentiation among schools or classes in schools will become a thing of the past.

STATEMENT NO. 14

(See p. 399)

STATEMENT OF JOHN H. WILSON, DIRECTOR OF THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE
OF THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII

JANUARY 9, 1946.

To: The CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE ON STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII.

As director of the Territorial Department of Public Welfare it is with deep pride that I herewith submit to you gentlemen of the Congressional Committee on Statehood for Hawaii this brief statement of our comprehensive program of public assistance.

"Public welfare" in Hawaii means just that. Every man, woman, or child in this Territory who needs and seeks relief is given assistance by this department. There are no residential tenure requirements. There is no ceiling on the extent of assistance granted to applicants beneath the ceiling of their requirements. And, of course, there is no discrimination as to race, color or creed.

Our Territorial Department of Public Welfare handles all programs in public assistance. Our relief work extends to all shores of the Territory. While most States render relief through municipalities as well as the State, we have in this one department uniform standards and practices.

The department renders:

Old age assistance, aid to the blind, aid to dependent children, child welfare services, general assistance, medical and dental care, hospitalization, and burial services.

In the first three categories of assistance, we are aided by Federal funds through the participation of the Public Assistance Department of the Social Security Board. See Exhibit 63A which is a summary of our personnel requirements and salaries paid, made by the Board and showing that our standards in this regard are the highest in the United States.

See Exhibit 63B which gives you statistics regarding our medical care program of which we are immoderately proud. The Wagner Act, not yet in effect by act of Congress, has been actually in effect in Hawaii, as far as the Territorial Department of Public Welfare is concerned, since July 1, 1943.

In our medical care department in the past two fiscal years, we have rendered assistance to 42,344 persons at a cost of \$905,804.30 and we have not received since the beginning of this service a single complaint regarding the help granted.

We are also proud of our record in the handling of funds placed at our disposal for public welfare work. Our disbursements for the calendar year 1944 totaled \$1,986,000 and in the last two annual audits of the Territorial Department of Public Welfare by the Federal auditors, there were no surcharges levied against the Territory for improper or illegal use of funds. The Federal auditors working under the direction of the Social Security Board declared to the director of this department that such a record had not been accomplished by any of the States.

We would also call your attention to the fact that the Territorial Department of Public Welfare handled all the Federal war assistance programs, including evacuation, with no confusion whatever. We are also handling the resettlement of returning evacuees.

And we add, perhaps immodestly, that in all the 48 States there are efforts being made to bring welfare programs up to various and certain practices which are here in force under the liberal Territorial laws; practices that give Hawaii the most extended and complete public assistance machinery in the Nation.

So, we say that no department of the Territorial government is, or has a right to be, prouder of its accomplishments of purpose than the department of public welfare. Our record of achievement is high, not only in the Territory, including the six islands in which we operate, but in the broader confines of the United States of which we are an integral part.

STATEMENT NO. 15

(See p. 400)

STATEMENT OF C. NILS TAVARES, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII, ON LAW ENFORCEMENT IN THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII

As attorney general of the Territory of Hawaii, I wish to make a statement on law enforcement in the Territory.

Law enforcement in the Territory, as in other American jurisdictions, is a function primarily of the police, prosecuting officers, courts and penal institutions. I am of the opinion that our present law enforcement agencies as a whole are as strong in organization and as efficient in the discharge of their duties as any like agencies elsewhere in the United States and I believe that the statistics will bear out my opinion.

HISTORY OF LAW ENFORCEMENT LEGISLATION AND PRESENT ORGANIZATION OF LAW ENFORCEMENT MACHINERY

Prior to 1932 all local police were under the jurisdiction of elected county sheriffs, subject to the weaknesses inherent in any system of elective police department heads. There was and still is a high sheriff of the Territory, and our laws still contain provisions,¹ carried over from the period before 1905 when there were no county governments in Hawaii, for a territorial police force, but these powers have not since been exercised except to provide a small force of process-servers, prison guards, etc. Therefore, since 1905, we have not had a really functioning territorial police force, and we have not needed one particularly, since the county police forces have generally been adequate.

¹ R. L. 1945, ch. 23.

Since all of the counties, except the city and county of Honolulu, were primarily rural communities, little difficulty was experienced for many years in the operation of their local police departments. However, the inefficiency of such an elective system finally became so clearly apparent in the city and county of Honolulu that in 1932 a law² was enacted setting up a police commission, the members of which were appointed by the governor with the approval of the Territorial senate in the first instance, with the provisions that as their terms expired, their successors were to be appointed by the mayor of the city and county,³ with the approval of the board of supervisors. The commission appoints the chief of police, who in turn, subject to civil-service regulations, appoints all subordinates. It is my belief that since its inception the Honolulu Police Department has become and is as efficient and well knit an organization as can be found anywhere in the country in a city of its size.

Recently by way of further strengthening our police enforcement in the various counties, the legislature has set up similar police commissions for each of the other counties of Maui,⁴ Hawaii,⁵ and Kauai.⁶ All members of the police commission (including that of the city and county of Honolulu, by virtue of an amendment passed in 1943⁷) are now appointed by the governor with the approval of the Territorial senate.

By such legislation, we have immensely strengthened the law enforcement machinery of the Territory, and I think it is universally conceded that all of our police departments are doing a magnificent job of law enforcement according to the modern methods, in spite of acute manpower shortages.

Likewise, the prosecution of offenders against the laws of the Territory and its political subdivisions is capably handled by county officers under the general supervision of the attorney general, a Territorial officer. The county attorneys of the counties of Hawaii, Kauai, and Maui, who are elective officials, and the public prosecutor of the city and county of Honolulu, who is appointed by the mayor with the approval of the board of supervisors of the city and county, are by law made ex officio deputies of the attorney general of the Territory and as such are subject to his direction and control in the prosecution of criminal offenses. The centralization of responsibility of all police commissioners under the governor and the control of the attorney general over all prosecuting officers of the Territory I believe, give further assurance of uniform and effective law enforcement throughout the Territory.

Our courts have their full share in the efficient administration of justice. They are well organized for that purpose. The judiciary consists of a supreme court, circuit courts, and district courts.

There are five circuit judges for the first judicial circuit, one circuit judge for each of the other three circuits (second, third, and fifth circuits—the third and fourth circuits having been combined into the third circuit under one judge by legislation enacted at the 1943 session of the legislature⁸ as an economy measure), and a district magistrate for every district in the Territory (except where two districts have been combined for reasons of economy). At the 1945 session of the legislature⁹ provision was made for the addition of a sixth circuit judge for the first judicial circuit, to be judge of the juvenile court. The position has not as yet been filled. The three justices of the supreme court and all of the judges of the circuit courts are appointed by the President of the United States with the advice and consent of the United States Senate while the magistrates of the district courts are also appointed by a single authority, the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court.

In the administration of criminal justice, the jurisdiction of the supreme court is chiefly appellate. Original jurisdiction over all offenses against the laws of the Territory is vested in the several circuit courts, which are courts of general jurisdiction and of record, although in practice only felony cases as a rule are instituted in the circuit courts. Original jurisdiction over misdemeanors and other minor offenses is exercised by the district courts.

Penal institutions in the Territory include the Territorial penitentiary known as Oahu Prison, to which are committed persons sentenced to imprisonment upon

² L. 1st Sp. Sess. 1932, Act 1; now R. L. 1945, ch. 131.

³ L. 1939, Act 104; R. L. 1945, secs. 6467-6482.

⁴ L. 1943, Act 62; R. L. 1945, secs. 6386-6401.

⁵ L. 1943, Act 64; R. L. 1945, secs. 6430-6445.

⁶ L. 1943, Act 183; R. L. 1945, sec. 6802.

⁷ L. 1943, Act 141.

⁸ L. 1945, Act. 142.

conviction of a felony, and jails in each county for the confinement of prisoners other than felons. There are also corrective institutions to which juvenile offenders may be committed by the juvenile courts. Control and supervision of the penitentiary and the prison camps which are part thereof and of the institutions for juvenile offenders is vested in the director of the department of institutions, who is a Territorial cabinet officer. The administration of the county jails is the responsibility of the chiefs of police of the several counties, except in the city and county of Honolulu where the sheriff, an elective officer, is charged with the administration of the city and county jail. Also, for each circuit other than the first judicial circuit (Honolulu), there is a board of prison inspectors, which has visitatorial powers over the county jails in their respective circuits. For the first circuit, the visitatorial powers are vested in the director of institutions. There is also a board of paroles and pardons which has visitatorial powers over all penal institutions in the Territory. Members of such boards are appointed by the governor with the approval of the Territorial senate. These boards are functioning efficiently.

To complete the picture of law enforcement machinery in the Territory, reference must be made to the United States District Court for Hawaii with its two district judges, the United States district attorney and his assistants, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the police forces of the armed services—the military police and the shore patrol. All are functioning at a high level of efficiency and are doing their full share in the suppression of crime and the maintenance of law and order in the Territory.

STATISTICS ON CRIMINAL CASES IN COURTS

In support of my contention that the administration of criminal justice in our courts is adequate and efficient, I wish to present statistics bearing thereon. (See exhibit 64a).

Table I of exhibit 64a gives (a) the number of criminal cases disposed of by each district court during the year 1944 and (b) the number of criminal cases pending in each court as of the date of the latest report on file with the clerk of the supreme court. Ranging from the two cases reported by the district court of Kalawao, where the leper settlement is located, to the 57,070 cases handled by the district court of Honolulu, these figures show that our district courts are capable of handling without delay the volume of a metropolitan center as well as the minimum requirements of rural areas.

Table II of exhibit 64a shows the operations of the district court of Honolulu, which handles many more cases than all the other districts combined, for the years 1939 to 1944, inclusive. Compared to the total of new cases filed each year and the average number of cases filed each day, the relatively small number of cases pending at the end of each year indicates the dispatch with which cases in that court are disposed of.

Table III of exhibit 64a gives the figures of the criminal cases in the circuit courts of the Territory. Consistent with the nature of the offenses which come before the circuit courts, the criminal cases in those courts are fewer in number and their disposition requires more time than cases in the district courts. There is, however, no indications of undue delays in their disposition, except perhaps in the first judicial circuit during the year 1944 when, due to combination of circumstances, the state of the calendar was not as favorable as usual. Among the factors contributing to the condition that year were the fact that the pressure of business of many jurors necessitated holding shorter sessions, the fact that the public prosecutor was unable to obtain the necessary assistants, both of which were due to the critical manpower shortage in the Territory at that time, the fact that there were several unusually prolonged murder trials during the term and, perhaps as a result of the resulting delays, the further fact that a greater number of demands for jury trial were made than usual. That condition, however, has been completely remedied during the 1945 term, and as of December 31, 1945, the number of pending cases was reduced to 45.

CRIME STATISTICS

I am presenting herewith exhibits containing detailed crime statistics together with graphs showing crime trends in relation to population. (See table IV of exhibit 64a, and exhibits 64b to 64f, inclusive.)

I should explain that the Federal Bureau of Investigation has designated eight classes of crime as "part I offenses" and uses these as an index to deter-

mine crime rates on a comparative basis throughout the country. These offenses are murder, manslaughter, rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny, and auto theft. On the basis of figures released by the Federal Bureau of Investigation up to June 30, 1945, it appears that Hawaii stands fairly low in its crime rates for part I offenses. (See table IV of exhibit 64a.)

Also, I should like to point out that the statistics and graphs submitted show that Hawaii's crime rate for part I offenses has not increased in proportion to the increase in its population. This indicates that there is no general crime wave in this Territory, although, as might be expected both from the increase in population and as an aftermath of a great and prolonged war with all of its unfavorable influences, some increase in the actual number of such crimes over the pre-war figures must be expected.

Finally, this data also discloses that the average crime rates for the first half of 1945 are actually lower than those for 1944 in the entire Territory.

I consider these circumstances as indicative of a healthy situation in this Territory.

STATEMENT NO. 16

(See p. 402)

HAWAII'S AMERICANS OF JAPANESE ANCESTRY IN THE ARMED FORCES

(By Lt. Col. Farrant L. Turner, Infantry, National Guard United States (inactive))

This is a brief review of the history and record of the part played in our armed forces during World War II by Hawaii's Americans of Japanese ancestry. While men and women of all races in Hawaii served faithfully and valiantly in many of our far-flung theaters of operation, the Army policy of segregating and organizing units composed of citizens of Japanese ancestry has made it possible to follow their activities particularly. The record thus made available is unique.

With the institution of selective service, citizens of Japanese ancestry were inducted into the Army under local quotas. However, the induction of Japanese Americans under selective service was discontinued after the February 1942 induction and not resumed until April 1944, and from February 1942 until February 1943 Americans of Japanese ancestry were not accepted by the Army even as volunteers.

At the time of Pearl Harbor there were 1,543 Japanese Americans who had been inducted into the Army. At that time there were also a number of Japanese Americans in the Reserve Officers Training Corps unit at the University of Hawaii.

When hostilities commenced on December 7, 1941, the university's Reserve Officer's Training Corps unit formed the nucleus of the Territorial Guard. In addition to the members of that unit, other citizens of Japanese ancestry joined the Territorial Guard. However, on January 19, 1942, the Japanese American members of the Territorial Guard were inactivated, whereupon they, together with other citizens of Japanese ancestry, totaling 169 members, formed a labor battalion and offered their services to the Army. Their offer was accepted and they became officially the Corps of Engineers Auxiliary, attached to the Thirty-fourth Combat Engineers Regiment. They were popularly known as the Varsity Victory Volunteers. Those men served in that organization until January 31, 1943, a few days after it had been announced that Americans of Japanese ancestry would be accepted for combat service and a call made for volunteers for such service, to which many of them responded. At the ceremonies at which the group was disbanded, Brig. Gen. Hans Kramer, Hawaiian Department Engineer, stated:

"You men have given substantial evidence of your patriotic willingness to serve. As department engineer under whose direction your work as V. V. V. has been carried out, I can attest to your loyalty and can deservedly commend you for that work. With this sincere commendation go my congratulations and good wishes—and confidence in your performance in a new and greater role as fighting members of the United States Army."

Meanwhile, 1,406 men of Japanese ancestry who had been inducted into the Army from time to time up to February 1942, when their induction ceased, and had been serving with the Two Hundred and Ninety-eighth and Two Hundred and Ninety-ninth Infantry Regiment (the Hawaii National Guard units), were

withdrawn from the National Guard units and sent to the mainland where they were activated as the One Hundredth Infantry Battalion (Sep.).

It was the spirit shown by the members of the Varsity Victory Volunteers and the record in training of the men of the One Hundredth Infantry Battalion, all of whom were of Japanese ancestry, which led to the announcement by the War Department in February 1943 of the reversal of its policy in regard to the enlistment of men of Japanese ancestry and to the issue of a call for volunteers to form a combat team of Japanese Americans. In answer to the call for 1,500 volunteers from Hawaii, a total of 9,507 men came forward to offer their services. Of this number, 2,645 were accepted and sent to the mainland where they were joined by Japanese Americans from the mainland and organized into the Four Hundred and Forty-second Regimental Combat Team, which was composed entirely of Japanese Americans except for a few officers.

Then came calls for volunteers to supply very badly needed language skills for the Military Intelligence Language School. In April 1943, 255 volunteers were enlisted and again in January 1944, 307 more volunteers were taken for this work. In addition to the volunteers for the Four Hundred and Forty-second Combat Team and for service with Military Intelligence, 854 others who were inducted during the period from October 1940 to October 1945 were volunteers. The total number of Americans of Japanese ancestry who were inducted as volunteers was thus 4,061, or 31.3 percent, almost one-third of all Americans of Japanese ancestry who served in the armed forces.

The record of our Japanese Americans in this war is notable even from the standpoint of the number of those who served in the armed forces. The total number of registrants subject to military service in the Territory was 123,000.¹ Those of Japanese ancestry numbered 43,979, aliens and citizens together, or 35.7 percent of the total. However, because of the response to the volunteering program, of the 25,013 servicemen inducted from Hawaii from December 1940 to September 1945, 12,981 were of Japanese ancestry, or 51.9 percent of the total. Of the volunteer enlistments from Hawaii totaling 6,208 up to October 1945, 4,061, as hereinabove stated, or 65.4 percent, almost two-thirds, were of Japanese ancestry. These figures and percentages are particularly significant in the light of the fact that from March 1942 to April 1944 registrants of Japanese ancestry were excluded from selective service calls and that from March 1942 until February 1943 even volunteers were denied enlistment.

Still more impressive than mere numbers is the record of the combat activities of the One Hundredth Battalion and the Four Hundred and Forty-second Combat Team and the achievements of Americans of Japanese ancestry who served in various capacities in many different areas. For bravery under fire and for cool-headed, efficient fighting in critical places, they have won the respect and honor of the American Nation. The One Hundredth Battalion established an enviable reputation as a fighting unit during the early days of the Italian campaign. The Four Hundred and Forty-second Combat Team spearheaded four major Allied offensives, three in Italy and one in France. They rescued the Lost Battalion of the Thirty-sixth Division when it was cut off near Bruyeres, France. Stars and Stripes (European edition) pointed to its unequalled record of decorations received for difficult and dangerous service to their country, listing the following awards:

President unit citations.....	5	Croix de Guerre (French).....	10
Meritorious service plaque.....	1	Soldiers' Medal (Italian).....	3
Distinguished Service Cross.....	65	Army commendations.....	50
Silver Star.....	290	Division commendations.....	82
Bronze Star.....	782		

All this was not accomplished without casualties, suffering, and sacrifice. Many a decoration was awarded posthumously, for exceptional bravery in action and devotion to duty above the call of duty. The casualty list of these units include 36 officers and 614 men killed in action. The list of wounded include a large proportion of their members. While not all of those killed or wounded were Americans of Japanese ancestry from Hawaii, they had their full share of casualties.

These services were valuable to the United States and they were appreciated by the men who were responsible for our military operations. Major General

¹ Statistics from Territorial selective service administration as of October 1945.

Dalhquist, commander of the 36th Division in France, said, when awarding one of the decorations mentioned: "We have only the utmost admiration for you and what you have accomplished. No finer fighting, no finer soldierly qualities have ever been witnessed by the United States Army in its long history." General Mark Clark, Lt. Gen. Lucien K. Truscott and other officers who directed the combat services of the Americans of Japanese ancestry in the United States Army have given similar testimony to the value and quality of these services on numerous occasions. Along with many other Americans of many different national origins and racial ancestries, the Americans of Japanese ancestry have proved conclusively their loyalty, devotion and value to the United States.

Among their most significant contributions, Americans of Japanese ancestry served as interpreters, censors, and intelligence workers in the armed forces. Few people in the United States at the outbreak of the war knew the Japanese language well enough to speak the language and read the literature fluently and accurately. Most of those who could were of Japanese ancestry. The work of volunteers for such services, both citizen and alien, in actual combat service and in teaching their knowledge to others in Army and Navy schools, was of the highest value to the United States, and undoubtedly contributed to the saving of thousands of lives of American soldiers, sailors and marines.

Those who oppose statehood for Hawaii because of the presence of Americans of Japanese ancestry would do well to take heed of the words of Lt. Gen. Delos C. Emmons who, in announcing the War Department's plan to induct Americans of Japanese ancestry for combat service in February 1943, predicted:

"The manner of their response and the record these men will establish as fighting soldiers will be one of the best answers to those who question the loyalty of the citizens of Japanese ancestry in Hawaii."

Respectfully submitted.

FABRANT L. TURNER.

JANUARY 15, 1946.

STATEMENT No. 17

(See p. 403)

STATEMENT OF ROBERT L. SHIVERS, FORMER SPECIAL AGENT IN CHARGE FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION, HONOLULU, T. H., AUGUST 1939-APRIL 1943

COOPERATION OF THE VARIOUS RACIAL GROUPS WITH EACH OTHER AND WITH THE CONSTITUTED AUTHORITIES BEFORE AND AFTER DECEMBER 7, 1941

It was the duty of the Federal Bureau of Investigation to make a thorough appraisal of all the factors which had a bearing on the internal security of these islands. Such an appraisal was instituted immediately upon my arrival in August 1939. A very complex racial situation then existed in Hawaii—one third of the total population being of Japanese extraction, the presence of large groups of people (Filipinos, Koreans, and Chinese) whose homelands had long been or would surely come under the heels of the Japanese Army (as later events proved to be true) in the event of a war in the Pacific, and the undercurrent of suspicion and growing fear of the behavior of the Japanese population in Hawaii. It was readily apparent that unless all the racial groups were held together and worked together as a united community in a common effort, not only would Hawaii's contribution in the event of war be seriously hampered, but it would be most difficult if not impossible to maintain the internal security of these islands and free the Army and Navy for their main task of prosecuting the war against the enemy without the necessity of using a part of their forces in maintaining order behind the lines among the civilian populace. A united front in this complex, cosmopolitan community was vitally necessary for the successful prosecution of the war in this theatre.

Steps were accordingly taken to insure this united front. In some cases, the initiative was taken by my office or by the intelligence offices of the Army and Navy; in other cases, it came voluntarily and spontaneously from the civilians of the community.

A complete survey was made of every phase of life in this community to determine if there were, in fact, any reason for the suspicion which had for years

been directed toward the loyalty of the Japanese population. This survey included the religion, education (the various language schools then in existence), and civic, economic, and social status of all the racial groups. As these surveys progressed, it became increasingly apparent that there was no reason to question the loyalty of the citizens of Japanese ancestry, except for a small number of Kibei who constituted .345 percent of the citizen population. It was also very clear after these surveys had been completed that a very small percentage of the alien Japanese in the Hawaiian Islands would be actively disloyal to the United States in the event of war between this country and Japan. Steps outlined in this statement were taken for the purpose of conditioning the racial populations for war and for dealing directly with the small disloyal element in the Islands.

To give you some concrete evidence of the size of the disloyal group in Hawaii, I would like to point out that from December 7, 1941, to the end of hostilities, there were only 1,440 persons of Japanese ancestry who were picked up for internment, or .9 percent of the total alien and citizen population of Japanese ancestry. This group may be further broken down to show that of the total interned, 879 were Japanese aliens. The total number of Japanese aliens who were picked up for internment was 879, and of that number, 301 were subsequently released or paroled after being brought before the internee hearing boards. There was a total of 534 American citizens of Japanese ancestry picked up for internment, and of that number, 160 were released or paroled after they had been given a hearing before the internee hearing board. In the citizen group there were 468 Kibei. There were 28 expatriated citizens of Japanese ancestry who were also interned. This means that there were, 981 citizen and alien Japanese who were actually interned and sent to war relocation camps on the mainland. You will better understand the significance of these figures if you know that at the time of Pearl Harbor there were approximately 120,000 citizens of Japanese ancestry in the Hawaiian Islands and 40,000 aliens. I do not intend to try to create the impression that the intelligence agencies picked up all of the disloyal subjects of the Japanese empire, or for that matter, all of the disloyal citizens of Japanese ancestry, but it is my purpose to show that the overwhelming majority of the citizen group was loyal to the United States and that if there were any disloyalty among the alien Japanese who remained at large, that disloyalty was never translated into action against the United States.

It would be impossible to describe in detail every step that was taken before and after December 7, 1941, but the following will give some idea of the plans which were laid before that date and the implementation of those plans during the entire period of the war. It is my hope that, among other things, this brief description will serve to show:

1. The cooperation and assistance given the constituted authorities by the civilian populace of all races in preparing the community for the exigencies of war and in maintaining a united effort during the war toward a common goal.
2. The active cooperation between the races, particularly among their leaders, and the lack of any serious open friction between the racial groups during the war—a fact which augurs well for the future welfare of this Territory or State.
3. The cooperation of the Japanese group and the valuable assistance given by certain members of this group, not only to the F. B. I., but to the intelligence services of both the Army and Navy. An accurate appraisal of the situation, insofar as this group was concerned, would have been impossible without their cooperation. Certain projects initiated and carried out by the Army (e. g., the recruiting drives for interpreters, the call for volunteers for the 442nd Combat Team in February and March of 1943) would also have been impossible without the active and valuable assistance which came from the leaders among this group.

ORGANIZATION OF GROUPS AND OTHER STEPS TAKEN PRIOR TO DECEMBER 7, 1941

1. *Advisory Groups Composed of Americans of Japanese Ancestry.*—Two of these groups were organized between April and June 1940. The personnel of these groups was carefully selected on the advice of men of non-Japanese ancestry who knew them personally and who also knew the Japanese community rather intimately through long years of study and direct contact with its members. It

consisted of men drawn from various walks of life, men of intelligence and ability whose loyalty to the United States was unquestioned. These groups met separately with me and with one of my agents to discuss and appraise all aspects of the Japanese community which might have anything to do with the maintenance of internal security and the probable behavior of this particular racial component in the event of war with Japan. Meetings were held at least once a week, sometimes oftener. The information which we were able to secure from these men through their keen insight into the psychology of the Japanese people in Hawaii and their accurate and wide knowledge of what went on among them helped immeasurably in our appraisal of the situation and in taking the necessary preparatory steps prior to Pearl Harbor.

These groups also helped to lay definite plans aimed toward the control of any subversive elements among their segment of the population. Some of these plans were placed in operation months before Pearl Harbor; the rest were either absorbed and implemented by other groups which were later organized, or found to be unnecessary or impracticable by the events which followed the outbreak of war.

2. *Oahu Citizens Committee for Home Defense.*—This was an outgrowth of the plans laid by one of the advisory groups mentioned above and embraced a wider range of the trusted leadership among the Americans of Japanese ancestry. The Committee was formally organized early in 1941. Among its purposes were the following:

(a) To work with the constituted authorities in the continuing task of evaluating what went on in the Japanese community.

(b) To plan for and carry out the task of bringing out more positively the inherent loyalty of the Americans of Japanese ancestry toward the United States.

(c) To prepare the Japanese community psychologically to their responsibilities toward this country in the event of war and for the difficult position in which the war would place them in their relationship with the rest of the general community.

One of the first and outstanding achievements of this committee was the sponsorship of a patriotic rally in June 1941. Some 2,000 citizens and aliens of Japanese ancestry in addition to about 200 invited guests of other races, filled the McKinley High School auditorium on the night of June 13, 1941, to hear Col. (now Brig. Gen.) M. W. Marston, then Assistant Chief of Staff for Military Intelligence, Hawaiian Department, U. S. Army, deliver a message on behalf of Lt. Gen. Walter C. Short, the then Commanding General of the Hawaiian Department, in which he enunciated publicly for the first time the official attitude of the U. S. Army toward those of Japanese ancestry, both citizens and aliens, in the event of war, and urged the people of all races to place their trust in the constituted authorities and refrain from any acts which might disrupt a united citizenry and place the Army in the position of having to enforce peace and order in the civilian community. He promised just treatment for all citizens, regardless of racial ancestry; swift and severe punishment for any and all whose acts are detrimental to the welfare of the United States; and fair treatment to the aliens of Japanese ancestry in the event of war so long as they conducted themselves in a manner unimical to the United States. This meeting helped immeasurably to allay much of the fear and insecurity which were then developing in this community as the war clouds gathered more ominously over the Pacific. It also provided some definite and clear-cut criteria to guide the behavior of the Japanese as well as the rest of the community in the event of war.

3. *Committee for Interracial Unity in Hawaii.*—The seeds for this group were sown as early as December 1940, almost exactly a year before Pearl Harbor, at a meeting called significantly enough by an American of Chinese ancestry at a time when the Sino-Japanese war was at its height. Present were representatives of most of the racial groups in Hawaii—Chinese, Japanese, Caucasian, and Hawaiian. The group met to consider ways and means of combatting the growing resentment of certain of the racial groups against those of Japanese ancestry which resulted from the aggressions of the Japanese Government and its various moves leading toward a general Pacific war. It was, however, fundamentally interested in the preservation of Hawaii's traditional pattern of race relationships, knowing full well that a war between Japan and the United States would place a severe strain on the racial harmony that was part of Hawaii and that unless something was done to prepare for the war which seemed inevitable, that pattern might be seriously disrupted.

Several subsequent meetings were held to consider the problem and to secure the active participation of as many as possible of the key leaders, both civilian and military, in the community. Following these preliminary organizational meetings, a steering committee was set up to carry on a quiet but aggressive program with the aid of a larger advisory committee which included representatives from every major racial group in Hawaii. The steering committee itself was inter-racial in character. It also included many of the key civilian leaders, both business and professional, and the heads of the Army and Navy Intelligence Services as well as the head of the local office of the F. B. I. who was selected to be its chairman.

Space does not permit a detailed description of the biweekly meetings held by this group and the many ways in which it helped to prepare the way for what followed in this community when the war finally came. The following aims, however, quoted from its report, guided its work and will give some idea of its scope and functions:

"(1) It is interested not only in the immediate problem of national defense as far as these islands are concerned, but also in the way the people of Hawaii are going to live together after the emergency is over. The latter is based on the assumption that if the people here of various races can continue to live together harmoniously during the emergency, trust each other, and cooperate even more closely than they have in the past, then a basis for a still better human relationship will have been established for the future. The contrary will be equally true.

"(2) As far as the immediate present is concerned, unity of purpose and action is absolutely necessary for a strong national defense. We cannot afford to have a divided citizenry—one race set against another or one class against another. The people of Japanese ancestry, both citizens and aliens, compose about one-third of our population. Accepted and united in purpose and action, they are an asset to the community. Rejected and treated as potential enemies, they are a burden, even a danger, to our security.

"To achieve this unity and to preserve the relatively fine human relationship which has so far prevailed in Hawaii, the people must—

"(1) Feel that Hawaii has something unique and worth while to preserve in the way of human relationships.

"(2) Accept the idea that a united citizenry is essential to our defense.

"(3) Have faith in the American way of life and be willing to protect it.

"(4) Place absolute reliance on our constituted authorities, confident that they will treat everyone with equal fairness and see to it that he is so treated by his fellow citizens, and that anyone acting in any way inimical to the general welfare will be promptly and severely dealt with. There is no need for and there must not be any vigilantism on the part of any group.

"(5) Overcome fear—fear on the part of the nationals of those countries with which we might become involved in a war that they will be mistreated and persecuted, and fear on the part of the rest of the people that these particular aliens might actively assist our enemies.

"(6) Develop a sense of personal responsibility to do everything possible to make Hawaii and the entire Nation strong militarily and otherwise. This includes the aliens who must accept the fact that they owe a certain obligation to the land in which they are now living and that they will be protected and allowed to enjoy all normal privileges only as long as they obey our laws and conduct themselves constructively.

"(7) Be willing to give every loyal citizen, regardless of race, a place in the scheme of national defense. No group should be denied the opportunity to do its share merely because of racial considerations.

"(8) Remember that loyalty grows only when it is given a chance to grow. It does not flourish in an atmosphere of suspicion, discrimination, and denial of opportunities to practice that loyalty."

Among the most important phases of its work were the meetings of various racial groups, particularly the Filipinos, called and addressed by Col. (now Brig. Gen.) Kendall J. Fielder who succeeded Colonel Marston as the Assistant Chief of Staff for Military Intelligence and who is still head of the Army G-2 in this theater, and by myself as head of the FBI. The Filipinos were of special concern to the group because of their impulsive characteristics and because it was obvious that their homeland would be one of the first places to be invaded by the Japanese Army. The Japanese aliens were also an important group not only because of their large number but because under control and, better still, with

their active cooperation, they could become a real asset to our war effort. The point stressed to them was the one already enunciated by the Army, namely, that so long as they conducted themselves in accord with law and did nothing detrimental to this country, they would be treated fairly and given every protection of the law. Civic and business groups were also addressed by Colonel Fielder, Colonel Marston, and myself in our respective official capacities, and by certain lay members of the committee who also talked to groups of mainland defense workers who were beginning to come to Hawaii in larger numbers.

Many governmental (including the Governor of the Territory and the Mayor of the city and county of Honolulu), civic, business, and racial leaders were also contacted by members of the committee.

These informal contacts and the meetings which were held throughout the Territory and which, in many instances, were publicized in the English and foreign language papers to insure adequate coverage, contributed much toward conditioning the civilian populace toward the idea of working together in the event of war and trusting the constituted authorities to handle the task of dealing with any subversive groups.

4. *Cooperation of individual members of all races.*—Aside from the groups mentioned above, the FBI received willing and valuable assistance from men and women of all races. Many of these people were concerned not only with the preservation of internal security in the event of war; they were genuinely interested in the American principle of fair play, wanted to see every racial group given the opportunity to contribute its just share toward the war effort and to preserve the Hawaiian way of racial harmony and cooperation.

I think the broad conclusion can truthfully be drawn that the people of Hawaii were conditioned for war by the long history of race harmony and cooperation, even more than by the special methods used just before and after the outbreak of the war. And I believe the behavior of the population and its magnificent contribution to the war effort fully justify this statement.

ORGANIZATION OF GROUPS AND OTHER STEPS TAKEN SUBSEQUENT TO DECEMBER 7, 1941

1. *Cooperation on December 7 and during the critical days which followed.*—Many of the individuals associated with the various groups mentioned in the foregoing section reported of their own accord to my office on the morning of December 7 to offer their assistance in putting into operation the plans they had helped to evolve during the months preceding the outbreak of hostilities.

2. *The Morale Section of the Military Governor's Office.*—This was the direct outgrowth of the preparatory work carried on by the Committee on Inter-racial Unity. Representatives of this committee called on me and on Colonel Fielder soon after the Japanese attack on Hawaii to offer their services in implementing the plans made prior to the attack. They also discussed their plans with the heads of the local Office of Civilian Defense. As a result of these meetings, a Morale Section was created in the Office of Civilian Defense on December 18, 1941. This later became the Morale Section of the Office of Military Governor on January 26, 1942.

Appointed to the Morale Section were a Caucasian (Charles F. Loomis), a Chinese (Hung Wai Ching), and a Japanese (Shigeo Yoshida)—all American citizens, of course. All three had been very active on the Committee on Inter-racial Unity and on other similar committees which functioned prior to Pearl Harbor.

To tell adequately the story of the Morale Section and its affiliated groups would take more space than is available here. Briefly, however:

1. It was appointed by the Army and worked under the immediate supervision of the Assistant Chief of Staff for Military Intelligence.

2. It maintained a close liaison with the FBI and the Military Governor's Office.

3. It naturally worked in close cooperation with and oftentimes through the civilian leaders and organizations in the community.

4. Its membership was interracial and it had an interracial advisory group which it consulted from time to time.

5. Its primary purposes were to (a) serve as a liaison between the Army and the civilian community on matters relating to public morale; (b) work toward the maintenance of a unified and cooperative community.

6. To carry on its work, it organized several racial subcommittees to work among their respective peoples. These subcommittees assisted in keeping their

people informed of Army orders affecting the civilian community, strove to maintain a maximum war effort, assisted in preventing racial feelings from becoming aggravated, and in general contributed much toward maintaining a sense of unity among the various racial groups in the community. In the case of the Japanese subcommittee (known as the Emergency Service Committee) similar groups were organized on each of the other islands and, in addition to the work common to the other racial subcommittees, did much to assist the Army in all its recruiting drives for interpreters and to bring out positively and aggressively the inherent loyalty of the Americans of Japanese ancestry in Hawaii as well as to keep the aliens on our side.

7. Through its affiliated committees and through the channels it had open to it among various segments of the community as well as the Army, it contributed a great deal toward maintaining the united front which I believe was most essential to our war effort in Hawaii and of which the people of Hawaii can be justly proud.

3. *The emergency service committee.*—This was one of the racial subcommittees organized by the Morale Section. It is included here for special mention because it was the group which spoke for and worked among the Japanese and because its work has been so outstanding. Its purposes as outlined in their progress report of March 25, 1944, were as follows:

"(a) To carry on a program of education which will strengthen the loyalty to America of both the citizens and aliens of Japanese ancestry.

"(b) To help them demonstrate their loyalty in concrete ways to speed the defeat of Japan and all other enemies.

"(c) To help them face realistically and cooperatively the difficult situation in which the war has placed them.

"(d) To cooperate with the authorities in meeting the many problems which affect the security of the islands and the welfare of all the people.

"(e) To work for the application of the fundamental values of American democracy in the treatment of all Americans, regardless of racial ancestry, fully realizing that military and other requirements sometimes make impossible the full application of this principle.

"(f) To meet, in cooperation with the Army, the Red Cross and other local, Federal and Territorial agencies, certain morale and personal needs of our boys in the service and of their families at home.

"(g) To organize and carry out, again in cooperation with other established agencies, definite plans for the rehabilitation of our returning disabled soldiers and for the solution of the many complex postwar problems of reemployment and readjustment.

"(h) To work with the leaders and organizations of other racial groups for the preservation of Hawaii's traditional harmony among all races and the promotion of a united home front."

Its accomplishments are too numerous to mention. Suffice to say that its influence was positively American, its work appreciated by the community, the Army and the FBI and its contribution toward the maintenance of interracial unity in Hawaii during the critical years of the war outstanding. A copy of their report is attached herewith.

4. *The Honolulu police contact group.*—This was a group similar in many respects, certainly in its major purposes, to the Emergency Service Committee except that it was sponsored by the Honolulu Police department under the able aggressive leadership of one of its officers, Capt. Anthony Burns, who for many months headed its espionage division which worked under the direction of the FBI. Its work was largely among the Japanese people of Oahu. Preparatory plans for it were laid long before Pearl Harbor but its actual organization was delayed until some weeks after Pearl Harbor. It, too, helped to allay the fears of the alien Japanese and to channel their efforts toward an American victory, as well as to encourage active participation of the Americans of Japanese ancestry in the war effort. Indirectly, it also helped to allay the fears of the other racial groups where the Japanese were concerned, thus contributing to the over-all unity of this community.

5. *The Citizens' Council and other groups organized to promote unity.*—The Citizens' Council was composed of many of our leading professional and business leaders. Among its aims was to keep this community united in purpose and action. It, together with other more informal groups, sprang up spontaneously throughout the Territory, particularly in Honolulu, and did much to avert frictions and tensions in the Territory's polyracial communities.

SABOTAGE AND FIFTH-COLUMN ACTIVITIES

There was not one single act of sabotage committed against the war effort in the Hawaiian Islands during the course of the entire war. Nor was there any fifth-column activity in existence or in evidence here. As a result of disclosures before the committee now investigating the Pearl Harbor disaster that fifth-column activity was present in Hawaii during the early days of the war, I made a statement to the press on December 31, 1945, as follows:

"In spite of what Admiral Kimmel or anyone else may have said about the fifth-column activity in Hawaii, I want to emphasize that there was no such activity in Hawaii before, during, or after the attack on Pearl Harbor. Consequently there was no confusion in Hawaii as a result of fifth-column activities.

"I was in a position to know this fact, and I speak with authority when I say that the confusion in Hawaii was in the minds of the confused, and not because of fifth-column activities.

"It was not the civilian population who was confused. Nowhere under the sun could there have been a more intelligent response to the needs of the hour than was given by the entire population of these islands.

"As a matter of fact, had it not been for the lack of hysteria in the civilian community and the orderly manner in which they responded as a result of the preparation the civilian community had made for war, especially the doctors, the law-enforcement agencies, and the office for civilian defense, there would have been confusion with which the community would not have been able to cope.

"The civilians in this community have never received the praise to which they are justly entitled for their contribution to the armed forces on that day and in the years following.

"It is high time that the people of the United States should be told of Hawaii's contribution to this war, which is unequalled in the annals of our country."

I am sure you gentlemen have heard the 101 rumors that have been spread throughout this Territory and the mainland United States since the day of the attack. One of these stories was to the effect that some of the Japanese aviators who were shot down over Oahu that morning were wearing class rings of McKinley High School. Another was that arrows had been cut in the canefields by the Japanese population which pointed toward Pearl Harbor and guided the attacking force to their targets. Another was that a transmitter had been discovered in the possession of some Japanese who were transmitting information to the enemy. Another was that the sides of a milk truck at Schofield Barracks suddenly collapsed and machine guns manned by Japanese opened fire on the soldiers at that post. There were many more rumors with which you are familiar. There was not an iota of truth in any of them. During the whole course of the war not one single transmitter was discovered on the Hawaiian Islands which was being used to disseminate information to the enemy and at no time was there any radio interference with our own communications because of jamming or transmission from unknown stations in the Hawaiian Islands.

No amount of repetition before the investigating committee will alter the fact that sabotage and fifth-column activity was never engaged in at any time prior, during, or subsequent to the attack on Pearl Harbor.

SOME GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

This brief statement does not cover adequately the story of Hawaii's interracial cooperation before and during the war and the cooperation of the various racial groups with the armed services and other governmental agencies whose primary concern was the protection of internal security and the vigorous prosecution of the war. It certainly does not do justice to all the individuals and groups concerned, particularly to those whose names are not mentioned either because they are unknown to me or because space does not permit the mention of every name involved. It does, however, show that:

1. Hawaii's people of various racial ancestries can and do work together, particularly in the face of a major crisis.

2. What goes on in the countries of their ancestors is of minor concern to them as compared to what goes on in their own country, the United States of America. The latter is their major concern as Americans.

3. Hawaii's people of all racial ancestries did cooperate with the constituted authorities in preparing for and in prosecuting the war against Japan.

4. This community, despite its polyracial composition, is essentially American in thought, purpose, and action.

5. The united effort of the civilian community during the war was the result, at least in part, of the preparations made jointly by the civilian and official leaders before the war.

6. If the actions of the people of Hawaii before and during the war is any criterion, they can be expected to work together in the future toward a common goal.

STATEMENT No. 18

(See p. 405)

STATEMENT OF HAROLD W. BOSS, DIRECTOR OF CIVIL SERVICE AND PERSONNEL CLASSIFICATION, TERRITORY OF HAWAII, JANUARY 15, 1946

A STATEMENT ON THE OPERATION OF CIVIL SERVICE AND CLASSIFICATION IN THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII TO BE ENTERED IN THE RECORD OF THE HEARING ON STATEHOOD FOR THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII

This statement was prepared upon request of the committee by Harold W. Boss, director of the civil service and personnel classification of the Territory of Hawaii.

The forerunner of civil service in the Territory of Hawaii was the civil-service system provided by the territorial legislature for the board of health in the year 1913. From that time forward there were many proponents of a Territorywide system of governmental employment.

In 1939, after an exhaustive community study by business and governmental leaders, it was proposed by the then governor that a system of civil service and classifications be adopted. The bill proposing civil service, which provided a personnel system based on merit principle and scientific methods, whereby a fair and equal opportunity for public service was guaranteed all citizens, and which would assure government employees of character and capacity jobs of a permanent nature and to improve the efficiency of the government by the improvement methods of the personnel administration, was adopted.

During the next 2 years after this bill became law, the Territory operated without benefit of a classification system; however, in 1941 at the special session of the territorial legislature, the Classification Act was approved, effective with November 1, 1941.

Civil service and classification proceeded to enhance the condition of government employment. From that time forward all employment with the Territory (as with the counties, but under each county's jurisdiction) government employment has proceeded as an orderly progressive function. All positions with the Territorial Government are benefited by the known advantages of the merit principle of employment and equity of classification wherein equal pay for equal work is provided.

This advanced method of governmental function which is identical to that of cities, counties and States of the mainland United States, as well as the Federal Government, has been in successful operation in the Territory for over 6 years. The operation of civil service and classification in the Territory compares very favorably with mainland governmental functions of this nature and in some instances it can with all modesty be stated that this function in the Territory is superior to that of certain mainland localities.

It has been my privilege to personally visit many civil-service jurisdictions of the United States as well as Canada and to have particularly scrutinized this function at the State and Federal level. As a result of these intimate comparisons I can satisfactorily justify our "State" level of operation in the Territory. Such survey trips for the purpose of maintaining our governmental employment at an efficient level are made periodically.

It should be of interest and value to your committee to know that the Territory has over 600 classes of positions falling within the professional and scientific; clerical, administrative, and fiscal; subprofessional; crafts and custodial; and the inspectional and investigational service. For your information a schematic list of our classified positions is attached to this statement.

Every endeavor is constantly being made to maintain this governmental function of employment without thought of our being a Territory but rather on the basis of our status as a "State" of the Union.

There is also furnished with this statement a copy of all laws and rules pertaining to civil service and classification with the Territory. (Not filed for the record.)

Respectfully submitted.

HAROLD W. BOSS, *Director.*

STATEMENT No. 19

(See p. 407)

STATEMENT SUBMITTED BY DANIEL K. AINOA, COMMISSIONER, HAWAIIAN HOMES COMMISSION

Background.—Born in Honolulu. Educated in the private and public schools of Honolulu. Graduated from the University of Hawaii in 1927 with a degree of bachelor of science in civil engineering. Engaged in government work since graduation for the Territory; United States, and with the Board of Water Supply of the City and County of Honolulu.

I am now division head with the board of water supply. I am president of the Hawaiian Government Employees' Association, an association similar to the National Federation of Federal Employees. And I am also a member of the Hawaiian Homes Commission.

Statement on the Hawaiian homes projects.—In my opinion, the housing projects under the jurisdiction of the Hawaiian Homes Commission, wherein the Commission has granted areas for house lots, have been successful as far as the intent of the Hawaiian Homes Act is concerned.

The projects wherein the Commission has granted farm areas to homesteaders have only been partly successful in that they have removed a large number of the recipients of these homesteads from tenement conditions into much healthier living conditions. However, the areas allocated to these homesteaders are arid in nature, and poorly suited to dry farming. The domestic water supply is also very limited.

Unless an adequate amount of domestic water and irrigation water is developed for these projects, I do not believe that the homesteaders will ever be able to farm their lands profitably. I also think that inasmuch as the act was one enacted by the Congress of the United States, the Federal Government should make some attempt to aid in the development of water for these areas, which are the Hoolehua and Kalamaula areas located on the island of Molokai.

In answer to a question by the honorable Homer D. Angell, of Oregon, as to the cost per acre of the proposed irrigation project for the island of Molokai, these costs are as follows:

If only Hawaiian Homes Commission arable lands were irrigated, the cost per acre would be \$908.

If all arable lands within reach of the project were irrigated, the cost per acre would be \$492.

Statement on statehood.—I am very much in favor of statehood for Hawaii at the earliest possible date. It is only natural for every American citizen to feel he should be on an even footing with every other citizen in the country.

Politically, I feel that Hawaii has served its apprenticeship and is now ready to be accepted on a par with all the other States of the Union. Hawaii's record of self-government and its contribution to the National Government and to the war effort in the war just ended, has proved that Hawaii is ready for statehood.

Opponents to statehood have raised points and have brought up arguments such as legislative inefficiencies. If one should scrutinize the record one can readily see that Hawaii's Legislature at every session has always passed upon a large volume of constructive legislation. It is true that some foolish bills do get introduced, but these very very seldom get through, and it is also true that some good measures do not get through. But what legislative body does not have the same experience?

There are those who oppose statehood that raise the Japanese question. I personally feel that those who believe that the Japanese are untrustworthy are just trying to conjure up a bogeyman. To me Hawaii has been one community under the flag that has come closest to solving the problem of racial harmony, as was intended under the Constitution of the United States, than any other community in the country. I feel those that cast doubts against a certain minority group are just as liable to cast doubts against any other minority group and are un-American in their thoughts and actions, in that they are passing upon the guilt of a group before that group is given a fair trial. And in my way of thinking, the group in question has already been put on trial during the past war and has been found not guilty as charged.

STATEMENT No. 20

(See p. 415)

STATEMENT OF H. P. FAYE

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF HONOLULU,
Honolulu 16, T. H., January 15, 1946.

HON. HENRY D. LARGADE, Jr.,

*Chairman and Members of the Congressional
Committee on Statehood, Honolulu, T. H.*

GENTLEMEN: For your records, a poll of the 1,307 firm and individual members of the Chamber of Commerce of Honolulu was taken during the past few days. A total of 679 votes were returned, which represents 52 $\frac{9}{10}$ percent of the entire membership. Of the ballots cast, there were 509 in favor of statehood for Hawaii now and 170 against. This is a ratio of 3 to 1 for statehood, which is higher than the poll on statehood taken in the general plebiscite in 1940, at which time the vote of the people of Hawaii was about 2 to 1 in favor of statehood.

Based on this 3 to 1 vote of the entire chamber membership, the board of directors of the Chamber of Commerce of Honolulu, at a board meeting held January 10, 1946, voted unanimously for immediate statehood and prepared a resolution endorsing statehood to be presented to this congressional committee. A copy of this resolution is attached hereto. [See Exhibit No. 70.]

The members of the Chamber of Commerce of Honolulu comprise firms and individuals of all races and not only the largest firms but also the small firms are among these members. The small firms far outnumber the large firms.

A break-down of chamber membership by races reveals that there are 804 Caucasians and Part-Hawaiians, 302 Japanese, 141 Chinese, 34 Koreans, and 26 Filipinos who are members of the chamber.

Figures concerning the business of Hawaii have been prepared for your records from official sources. Separate presentations have already been made covering the sugar industry, the pineapple industry, diversified agriculture, coffee and fishing.

Under the heading of "Business" in the record of statistical data appear the following exhibits:

(a) Number of business establishments by calendar years, Territory of Hawaii, 1935-45.

(b) Number of persons (including corporations) engaged in various types of business as of December 1945.

(c) Dollar volume of business in various classifications as shown by gross income tax records, 1936 to 1944. (Comparative statement of gross income and consumption taxes collected and the tax base for the calendar years 1936 to 1944).

(d) Retail sales per capita, Continental United States and Territory of Hawaii, 1938-44.

(e) Agencies representing sugar plantations by number of plantations and percent of total sugar production.

(f) Bank deposits, 1901-45.

(g) Consolidated statement of condition of banks and trust companies.

(h) Consolidated statement of conditions of building and loan associations.

(i) Consolidated statement of condition of licensees under the Industrial Loan Act, Territory of Hawaii.

(j) Statement of public utilities.

These official business tables and the brief statements to be made about them establish the fact that Hawaii is in a healthy economic condition, supports its government and its public services well and, as a part of the body politic, adds economic strength to the Union. This condition was revealed by the data provided the Congressional Statehood Committee of the Seventy-Fifth Congress which visited Hawaii in 1937.

The report of the previous hearings on statehood covered every phase of our community life, including industry, trade, commerce, and finance, and contained complete and detailed data in support of Hawaii's qualifications for statehood. These facts and statistics have been brought up to date in the exhibits mentioned. This supplementary data even more convincingly sets forth Hawaii's qualifications for immediate statehood.

Respectfully submitted.

H. P. FAYE, *President.*

STATEMENT No. 21

(See p. 412)

BRIEF OF STANLEY C. KENNEDY, IN SUPPORT OF STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII, BEFORE THE HOUSE TERRITORIAL AFFAIRS, SUBCOMMITTEE ON STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII

HONOLULU, T. H., *January 15, 1946.*

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.,
Chairman, House Territorial Affairs,
Subcommittee on Statehood for Hawaii.

DEAR SIR: I am appearing before this committee in support of statehood for Hawaii. In my opinion, the people of this Territory have proved capable in every way of governing themselves. They have also proved their loyalty in World War II as they did in World War I, and have a fine record to show for it.

The progress and development in agriculture and related industries, including the utility and transportation systems, in social welfare and security for all, in public health and public education, and the general high standard of living of this Territory entitle this community to full consideration of its request for statehood.

Respectfully,

STANLEY C. KENNEDY.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF STANLEY C. KENNEDY

President, general manager and director of Inter-Island Steam Navigation Co., Ltd., and of Hawaiian Airlines Ltd., Honolulu, T. H.

Born in Honolulu, T. H., July 7, 1890. Primary and high school education in Hawaii; Stanford University in 1908, graduating in 1912. Employed by the Inter-Island Steam Navigation Co., Ltd., which company operates steamers between the islands of the Hawaiian group, dry docks, shiprepair shops, a waterfront terminal, and is agent for trans-Pacific shipping companies. In World War I, following commissioning as ensign, served with Naval Aviation Operations in Washington and at Killinghouse Naval Air Station in England, as a first pilot of H-16 flying boats. After discharge from the Navy as lieutenant (jg), returned to Hawaii, reentered the employ of the Inter-Island Steam Navigation Co.; served as secretary and operations manager of the company for several years, becoming president in 1932, which position he still holds. Was instrumental in organizing Inter-Island Airways, Ltd. (now Hawaiian Airlines, Ltd.), in 1929, becoming its vice-president and manager, and its president in 1932.

The Territory of Hawaii is a community composed of a group of islands stretching over a distance of approximately 400 miles and as can be said of any community, its economic and social integration depends on the adequacy of its transportation system. Unlike most States and communities which are generally served by several types of transportation, for example, a highway system permitting the use of private autos, busses and trucks, one or more railroads, an airline and sometimes a surface carrier; Hawaii has but two types of transportation, the surface carrier and the air carrier.

It is germane to the question of statehood, therefore, to consider the part which these two principal forms of transportation have played in the past development of the Territory, to consider the adequacy of the present inter-island transportation system and something of the planning which is now being given to meet the future needs of the Territory.

Hawaii's surface transportation since the early days of the first ruling Monarch, Kamehameha I, reads like a story book. I will not take the time to go into detail but do think by hitting at some of the high spots, you will have a better picture of the development of this type of transportation.

The first period of any form of surface transportation might well be called the "Ancient Hawaiian Canoe Transportation Period." This period extended from the earliest days up to the death of Kamehameha II.

Although the economic needs of the Hawaiians in this period could be satisfied on each island as a unit, fish, fowl, vegetables, and fruits furnishing the necessities of life, hundreds of canoes did play their part in the system of inter-island communication. It played the part of the radio, of the telephone, of sailing and steamships and the airplane.

In 1791, Kamehameha I, himself, was reported to have had a fleet of 700 canoes which carried on the major part of the commerce of the islands. By 1806, he owned a fleet of 15 small brigs and sailing craft. The first sign of a regular service came in 1810 when the King ran a small sloop as a packet between Hawaii and Oahu. Although the King died in 1819, his successor Kamehameha II continued the maritime enterprises of the first King.

Sailing craft at that time and immediately following took as long as 7 days to make the passage between the islands, and although they did play a large part in the early development of trade and commerce, it was nothing to the part played by the development of steamer service.

To secure a comprehensive and well balanced picture of steam operation among the islands and the part it played in the development of the new American Territory, one must follow the story from 1852 when the American steam schooner *Constitution* sought to establish an interisland service to the present day when the islands are served by a fleet of steamers especially designed for their routes, and operating on schedules specifically adapted to the needs of a community of approximately 500,000, living on seven major islands.

Several attempts beginning in 1852 were made to promote steamer service with mainland capital. Steamers selected for the trade were not suited for the islands trade; they were either too large and costly to operate, too small, too old and the owners were unwilling to build especially for the trade. One attempt after another failed, the result of which no other mainlanders further cared to risk their dollars in pioneering an operation the development of which would require years. If the people of Hawaii were to have steamer service for passengers and freight, a service obviously needed by reason of their community's geographical make-up, it was up to the people of Hawaii to finance and operate their own vessels. Only then would care really be given to the choosing of the types of ships to be used in the trade, and this is an important detail. Only at greater original cost of designing specially suited ships could residents of the islands expect to initiate any sort of successful enterprise.

From that date to this, interisland transportation has been developed by the island people themselves.

Following 1860, the Hawaiian Government helped in the financing of companies or individuals interested in island operations. Help was given by means of construction subsidies, operating subsidies, and in one case, that of the Hawaiian Steam Navigation Co., in 1861, a 6-year exclusive franchise was given.

The Reciprocity Treaty was signed in 1876 and with it began a period of rapid development in agriculture resulting in increased steamship building and operation. In 1877, the steamer *Likeliike*, built by the government but sold to S. G. Wilder before its arrival here, was put into service and became the first vessel of the Wilder Steamship Co.'s fleet. The steamer *James Makee* was built in San Francisco in 1878 for Captain T. R. Foster and went into service between Kauai and Honolulu. Captain Foster added to this fleet and with several of his associates, incorporated the Inter-Island Steam Navigation Co. in 1883.

For the next 20 years, these two companies operated in the islands, each serving separate islands, it being realized that there was not sufficient business to warrant direct competition. In order to cut down overhead that overlapped, a merger in 1905 was negotiated wherein Wilder Steamship Co.'s stockholders received stock and/or cash from the Inter-Island Steam Navigation Co. for their holdings.

Following this merger a complete reorganization of the services was initiated and a program of new construction was begun. The Territory and the public have materially benefitted through the development of this service, and the building of more modern and faster steamers as demands of the shippers and travellers became known has been the history of the Territory's surface transportation company.

Transportation necessarily changes with the trade to be served and this has been especially true in the Territory. In the earlier days of the carrier's history the freighting of sugar from the outports to Honolulu for transshipment to the mainland represented a larger part of the tonnage. These sugar mills and their communities on outside islands also resulted in considerable volume of general freight and fertilizer moving from Honolulu to other islands. But the ultimate development of sugar, the Territory's main industry, of necessity involved the elimination of a system of double handling of cargoes. This resulted in the construction of harbors and breakwaters at outside island ports where trans-oceanic steamers could pick up their sugar cargoes direct for the refineries. This also enabled direct shipments of certain supplies and equipment from the mainland. This simply shows how the requirements can change over a period of years, and while the carrier lost valuable traffic with savings in the economy of sugar production, the carrier had to content himself with his share in the over-all development of the community.

The reverse of this change happened with the growth of the pineapple industry. The islands of Molokai and Lanai in the early twenties were found to be very suitable for the growing of pineapples but water shortage on both of these islands necessitated the shipment of the fresh fruit grown there to Honolulu for processing. Because of the nature of the fruit, special equipment had to be developed for its movement to Honolulu. Studies made by carrier and the pineapple companies resulted in a design of a barge to be towed to and from Honolulu as the best means of transport. Young Bros. Ltd. and the Inter-Island Steam Navigation have been the carriers that have benefited through this development of the pineapple industry and today own large fleets of barges and towboats that are not only used in the pineapple trade but in other trade during the off-season period.

Perhaps the most important of the Territory's three principal industries to the economy of the carrier has been the tourist business. To the building up of this industry many local businesses have contributed and many have benefited, but it has remained for the carrier to assume the responsibility of a leading roll. But this responsibility has included not only the providing of transportation between the islands by ship and, as I will discuss later, by airplane, but it has also involved hotel facilities on the off islands in order to make available to the visitor the wonders and beauties and recreation opportunities that exist there.

With the loss of inbound sugar cargoes, the carrier's attention was directed toward fostering other lines of production, toward the integration of such industries as the production of Canec and the growing and marketing of fresh vegetables and fruits for the Honolulu retail market. The carrier, by means of reasonable rates and the employment of personnel and the providing of facilities at its own expense, has assisted in the development of these industries.

Although the development of adequate harbor works and terminals for deep water vessels or the off islands has and will continue to restrict the volume of the carriers' traffic, there is no indication that this factor or any other will eliminate the necessity for frequent and dependable surface transportation between the islands of this community. In fact, the more complete development of the Territory as a whole attaches an even greater importance to this service. Enthusiasts may argue that the airplane will completely displace the surface carrier in the not too distant future but this is not the opinion of even the leaders in the air transport industry. On the contrary, the opinion of informed persons is that the airplane, providing a new form of transportation, will produce through the equipment and supplies necessary for its operation additional traffic for the surface carrier. Each form of transportation will undoubtedly have its place in the ever more important field of transportation.

The tourist business began to show real signs of growth in the early twenties. Announcement by mainland carriers of additional service that were planned, together with new construction that followed, providing fast de luxe modern type of passenger service, was good news to the Territory.

It became evident that with this program for new business, particularly in passenger travel, the local fleet, which in earlier years had been fully adequate to

handle island transportation needs, would soon become inadequate even though further additions had been made from time to time.

It was not long before the local carrier had plans and actual construction under way for a fleet of fast modern combination passenger and freight steamers for local service.

A fleet of four vessels was built within a few years, which vessels represent as modern types as could be built. They are fast steamers, built especially for the Hawaiian trade, with berthing accommodations for over 450 passengers except for the *Humuula*, which has a speed of 14 knots and is a cattle-type ship with accommodations for 80 passengers only.

Ships required for service in the islands are the equivalent of transoceanic equipment, especially in structural features. Hawaiian waters are not smooth, and in cross channel operation, where a vessel must continually steam into all types of weather, ships considerably more staunch than those for inland water service or some of the coastal services are required.

For the 10-year period, 1932-41, local inter-island ships carried 1,330,931 passengers and 2,664,966 revenue tons exclusive of cattle.

For 1940, the last year of full commercial operation, these same ships carried 158,328 passengers, 216,512 revenue tons, and 18,099 head of cattle.

The part that these ships in Hawaiian trade have played in the war effort is worthy of mention. Several months before war was declared, two steamers of the local carrier were chartered on special missions to the Line Islands as were some of our towboat and barge equipment. In spite of this, the requirements of shippers and the traveling public were met, in part, by increasing and speeding up of schedules.

On May 1, 1942, all of the company's steamers were requisitioned for charter by the War Shipping Administration. One the *Haleakala*, was assigned to the Army Transport Service but the balance of the fleet was assigned to the Inter-Island Steam Navigation Co. to operate for the account of the War Shipping Administration.

The manner in which these ships fulfilled their wartime missions is attested by the War Shipping Administration which, on October 10, 1944, awarded a special certificate to Inter-Island Steam Navigation Co., "In recognition of meritorious service to the United States in time of war."

Operating of interisland shipping during the 4 war years was under the direction of the Office of Cargo and Passenger Control, a unit of the United States Army. All cargoes and all passengers were carried under direct priority systems established by the military. During these war years the vast majority of passengers and cargo carried consisted of personnel and equipment for the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard.

It is interesting to note here that interisland shipping, while fulfilling every mission and requirement presented by the armed services, was able to play a highly important role in maintaining necessary civilian activities. One hundred thousand tons of civilian cargo were transported between the islands in 1944 without the delay of a single ton of military supplies. This civilian tonnage represents but a small percentage of the total carried by the ships.

Inter-Island's vessels have made many missions far from their regular trade routes. Logs of the vessels will reveal blacked out voyages to such places as Midway, Christmas, Howland, New Caledonia, Jarvis, Johnston and other once-highly strategic areas. These ships are still in Government service.

The present fleet of the company represents an investment of \$5,000,000, and its vessels have been maintained in best possible condition.

Recognizing the important function of transportation in a postwar return to stabilized business and economic conditions, the carrier is now studying the probable future character of the traffic to be served with a view to adapting its services and the design of its ships to best meet the requirements. The carrier is further planning the investment of \$3,000,000 in new equipment and facilities to serve the trade in an economical and satisfactory manner, and one best calculated to foster the growth and prosperity of the Territory. It recently brought a well-known shipbuilder to Honolulu to study requirements and consult with company officials on the trends in ship design which have been a byproduct of the war. Plans and specifications of a new type or types of ship are now in preparation, and as soon as the design has been decided upon the company expects to call for bids.

The carrier is conscious of the impending increase in travel by the American public and wishes to study methods of handling the increase which will come to Hawaii. It recognizes that if a greatly increased number of visitors come to

the islands the quality and adequacy of the facilities for their accommodation and entertainment, principally in places outside of Honolulu where most of the scenic attractions are located, will be of the greatest importance in the complete development of this third island industry, the "tourist business."

It is also believed that the expanded population of Honolulu will provide a considerable volume of visitors to the off islands.

The importance of keeping the Territory abreast of competition in the tourist field is fully realized. The value of the best obtainable opinion and advice in providing acceptable transportation and accommodations to make the scenic attractions readily accessible to the visitors is recognized. With these factors in mind the company has engaged expert services in the field of hotel design and operation, and in traffic and promotion work.

The company for a number of years has been financially interested in the hotel business in connection with its carrier operations. In 1928 it built the Kona Inn in the Kona district of Hawaii island. With the building up of the Territory as a tourist resort the importance of Kona as a tourist attraction for longer than an overnight stay has become apparent, and to provide the necessary facilities there the inn has been twice enlarged. Plans are now under way for a complete renovation and further enlargement in the facilities that is estimated will cost approximately \$300,000.

The company has just purchased the old Lihue Hotel, situated at Lihue, Kauai Island.

For some time it has been recognized that the tourist facilities on the island of Kauai have not been adequate to the complete development of the island's natural attractions and at the request of a representative group of Kauai residents, this property has been acquired with the intent of providing Kauai with a first-class hotel located near its center of population and accessible to its many attractions. The company stands ready to invest upward of \$500,000 in this project.

The improvement of facilities at the Kona Inn and the acquisition of the Lihue Hotel property are only the first steps in the company's plan for the complete development of adequate and attractive hotel facilities on all the principal off islands.

In giving you a résumé of the history of surface transportation in Hawaii, sight must not be lost of what air transportation has done and will do for the Territory.

Scheduled air transportation between the islands of the Hawaiian group was first placed in operation on November 11, 1929. The carrier was Inter-Island Airways, predecessor of Hawaiian Airlines, which was incorporated on January 30, 1929, under the laws of the Territory of Hawaii. Initial service was provided by 8-passenger amphibian type airplanes which were replaced in 1936 by 16 passenger amphibians. In 1941, when suitable airports became available, the amphibians were replaced by the Douglas DC-3 land airplanes, the same equipment used by most of the air-lines on the mainland.

Passenger service.—The traffic record for the four war years that passengers were carried between the islands in the following numbers:

1942	82, 397
1943	107, 945
1944	110, 242
1945	160, 200

This is equivalent to an aggregate number of some 460,000 in 4 years, which is approximately the normal prewar population of the islands. In the year 1945 the figure of 160,200 passengers carried indicates that, numerically, one out of every three residents of the Territory used air transportation in that year.

Air cargo.—In order to meet the emergencies caused by the disrupted surface transportation between the islands in the war years, an air-freight service for the transportation of air cargo was placed in effect early in 1942. This, incidentally, was the first scheduled air-freight service operated by any United States air-line. This service met a very definite need in the transportation of cargo such as blood plasma, hospital supplies, vaccines, perishables and other material of an emergency and valuable nature. That the people of the islands were quick to take advantage of this modern means of cargo transportation is demonstrated by the cargo figures for the war years, which are as follows

	Pounds
1942	1, 291, 687
1943	4, 598, 456
1944	5, 589, 170
1945	5, 032, 872

Air mail.—The Territory was without air mail service between the islands until October 8, 1934, on which date an air-mail contract was entered into between Post Office Department and the carrier. Fortunately, the air-mindedness of the residents of the Territory has produced sufficient passenger and freight revenue to enable air mail to be transported without the need of a subsidy from the Government. At the present time the carrier's revenue from air mail represents less than one-half of one percent of the total operating revenues; in fact but \$10,689.56 was paid by the Post Office Department as compensation for carrying air mail during the year 1945. Figures for the domestic air-lines on the mainland for 1945 are not available but in 1944, compensation paid to them by the Post Office amount to 20.7 percent of their total revenue.

Passenger fares.—Fares have been reduced a number of times since the inception of the service. The tabulation below gives a comparison of the 1939 fares with 1945 fares:

	1939	1945
Honolulu to Hilo.....	\$30	\$15
Honolulu to Maui.....	20	10
Honolulu to Kauai.....	20	10
Honolulu to Molokai.....	15	5

Nonscheduled air transportation.—Prior to the war there was very little nonscheduled operation but since the termination of active hostilities a number of companies have signified their intention of inaugurating nonscheduled operations and one company has already made a number of nonscheduled flights. It is probable that in the postwar period nonscheduled air transportation will show increased volume and, together with the scheduled transportation, will provide a well rounded air transportation system for the residents of the Territory. It is also expected that there will be a considerable volume of private flying, student instruction, and service and sales of private aircraft in the postwar period.

Future plans for scheduled island service.—Plans for scheduled interisland contemplate the improvement of the service over the routes presently operated as well as the provision of service to other communities as quickly as airports in these areas are available. These communities will include Lanai, Kalaupapa, Hana, Upolu and Kailua. The over-all plan contemplates an extension of the period of the day during which service is provided to each airport and a corresponding increase in the frequency of schedules. This necessarily requires flight operations during the hours of darkness and means that airway navigational aids must be improved in some cases and new aids installed in other cases. Work on this program is presently being carried out between the carrier and the Civil Aeronautics Administration and it is hoped that within the near future the airways throughout the islands can be adequately equipped for round-the-clock operations.

Hawaii's link with the mainland.—In past years Hawaii has suffered in many ways through its geographical remoteness from the mainland of the United States. With the advent of adequate air transportation, it is anticipated that this obstacle will finally be removed. Hawaii will then be closer to Washington, D. C., as far as time to get to and from there is concerned than any of the Pacific Coast and Rocky Mountain territories were when they became States. It is proper at this time, however, to state that the air transportation in the prewar period between Hawaii and the mainland was inadequate. With respect to the route between the mainland of the United States and Hawaii, it may well be contended that the people of the Territory are more conscious than any other group that this is, in reality, a domestic service connecting one part of the United States with another. Accordingly, the service which is provided should be the same type that is provided by any domestic carrier, with respect to frequency of service, type of equipment used, and all the other factors which enter into providing good air transportation at reasonable rates, and Hawaii should not in any way be discriminated against because of its geographical location.

The Civil Aeronautics Board presently has applications from four United States airlines, from one steamship company, and from one aircraft manufacturer, to provide additional service between the mainland and the Territory. It is hoped that the Board awards a certificate to operate over this route to at least one of these applicants in the near future since the service is badly needed. If a certificate is granted to the local air carrier, which is one of the applicants, that

carrier intends to establish its main operating base in Honolulu and to integrate the island service with the trans-Pacific service. It is believed that such an integrated operation based in the Territory will produce many benefits for the people of the Territory who, after all, should be first considered since they have the most at stake in the transportation system which connects them with the mainland. Counsel for the Interior Department in oral argument before the Civil Aeronautics Board in the recent *Hawaiian case*, argued along these lines.

Hawaii's position as a gateway to the western Pacific will be more important than ever in the postwar era. Claims have been made for the superiority of the so-called great circle route which lies across southern Alaska, the Aleutians, and the Bering Sea. It appears to us there is little doubt that the comparatively minor saving in distance afforded by this route is more than off-set by the better terrain and weather conditions existing in the route through Hawaii. It is therefore believed that for many years to come the greater portion of air traffic between the United States and the Orient will flow over this central Pacific route through Hawaii.

STATEMENT No. 22

(See p. 428)

THE TRANSPORTATION PHASE OF STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII

(A statement on behalf of the Matson Navigation Co., before the Subcommittee on Statehood, United States House of Representatives, by Randolph Sevier, vice president, Castle & Cooke, Ltd. (agents for the Matson Navigation Co.), Iolani Palace, Honolulu, T. H., January 15, 1946)

SUMMARY OF STATEMENT

The complete statement argues that Hawaii's transportation is of such a quality and dependability as to qualify the Territory for immediate statehood.

Captain Matson entered the trade with a sailing vessel in 1882. In 1901 he combined his fleet with one operated by the planters on Oahu. That was the beginning of the present Matson Navigation Co. It also marked the beginning of regular, dependable service for the infant sugar industry.

In 1914 or '15 Matson stayed with the island service while others deserted for the more lucrative trade in other waters resulting from war in Europe. When the United States entered World War I the Government took over the Matson fleet, which was by then the backbone of the merchant marine in the Pacific.

Matson continued to improve its fleets of passenger and freight vessels between the two World Wars and again was ready to serve the Nation when the Maritime Commission took over its fleet in World War II. Its contribution to victory included troop transport and freight service in all the oceans of the world.

The company has assisted in the pioneering of trans-Pacific aviation and now stands ready to provide a complete sea-air service to Hawaii and the mainland. In addition the company is investing huge amounts of capital in a complete new fleet of fast freight ships and in the rebuilding of its passenger liners to serve the people of Hawaii.

Transportation service that has always been progressive and aggressive in behalf of the Hawaiian trade has contributed heavily to the outstanding development of the islands in a relatively short time—and to their present readiness for statehood.

SUMMARY OF ADDENDUM

Charges of monopoly, high rates, discrimination, and conspiracy to suppress truck farming have been leveled against Matson in documents or testimony before the subcommittee on statehood.

The facts constitute a clean record of honesty, fair dealing, and progressive service to the people of Hawaii.

The several charges are answered in some detail in the addendum.

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, Judge Robertson has asked me to tell you briefly of Hawaii's transportation facilities and their essentiality in linking Hawaii and continental United States and establishing it as an integral

part of the Union of States. It is a pleasure to tell that story for it is one of which we are especially proud.

The quality of Hawaii's transportation services along with the record of their performance during the war argues strongly that Hawaii is a modern American community eligible in this respect for admission as a State in the Union.

Captain William Matson, founder of the Matson Navigation Co., played a leading role in the economic development of Hawaii through his pioneering in the field of transportation. Sixty-four years ago, in 1882, Captain Matson, in association with several owners or managers of sugar plantations on the Island of Hawaii, invested \$20,000 in a three-masted wooden schooner of 300 tons cargo capacity. The ship carried sugar from Hilo to the mainland and brought back plantation supplies and general merchandise. This was the first direct line from the Island of Hawaii to the mainland.

As trade increased more vessels were acquired. By 1901 the fleet included five sailing ships aggregating 4,000 tons capacity. The present Matson Navigation Co. was formed in that year to consolidate this fleet with the 10 sailing ships known as the Planters Line. The owners of this line were planters principally located on the island of Oahu. It therefore followed that the ownership of Matson was, and still is, predominantly in the hands of the people of Hawaii.

The fact that these facilities have been developed largely through the energies of the people of the Territory argues further that the people themselves are competent to accept the responsibilities of statehood.

Here are the facts: As the artery which ties the Hawaiian economy to the rest of the United States there is the system of surface transportation between Hawaii and the mainland. Prior to the war, this service was provided largely by five American and two foreign flag steamship operators, as follows:

Matson Navigation Co., providing a regular general cargo, refrigeration and lumber service from ports in California, the Columbia River and Puget Sound on the Pacific coast, and in conjunction with the Isthmian Steamship Co., a service from North and South Atlantic and Gulf ports. These services accounted for approximately 85 percent of the total domestic trade between Hawaii and the continental United States.

Oceanic Steamship Co., serving Honolulu, Pago Pago, Suva, and ports in New Zealand and Australia, carried freight to and from Hawaii, the continental United States and the antipodes.

American President Line, operating vessels to the Orient and around the world, called at Honolulu weekly on west-bound voyages and biweekly on east-bound voyages.

Lykes Bros. Steamship Co., operating a service to the Far East from Gulf ports in the United States, called infrequently at Hawaii, and on occasions loaded or discharged domestic freight at Honolulu.

Canadian Pacific Lines, operating from Vancouver, British Columbia, to ports in China, Japan, and the Philippines via Honolulu in each direction.

Canadian Australasian Line, operating on a basis of approximately one voyage each month, north- and south-bound, between Vancouver, British Columbia, and the antipodes via Honolulu in each direction.

The ships in these services brought to the islands the commodities which make our industries run and which have placed the standard of living of our people on a par with that of residents of the most economically advanced States on the mainland.

The Matson-Oceanic passenger ship fleet comprises the sister ships *Lurline*, *Mariposa*, and *Monterey* built in the early 1930's at a cost of more than \$8,000,000 each. These were all express liners of 18,000 tons each, with accommodations for 700 passengers. Refrigeration and other freight facilities, together with 21 knots speed, made them also express freighters. A fourth luxury ship, the *Matsonia*, was completely modernized in 1937. It also has a speed of 21 knots.

The four ships maintained a schedule between California and Hawaii of five sailings a month, with one to Australia every four weeks. When the United States entered the war, these four liners went to war along with the rest of the Matson fleet. They are still being operated as troop transports by the War Shipping Administration but are expected to be returned to the run as the troop redeployment policies of the Government and reconversion will permit. Two of these completely rebuilt, airconditioned steamships, having every latest improvement and facility, will provide a weekly service from and to Los Angeles and San Francisco at the earliest possible date.

It is understood that all these schedules, both freight and passenger, will be resumed as rapidly as the vessels involved are released by the United States and Canadian Governments for commercial operation.

"Hawaii—Crossroads of the Pacific" is a phrase which, while an old one, has far more truth to it today than when it was coined. The war emphasized the importance of Hawaii as our country's western outpost.

I may speak with authority only for the Matson Lines and the Isthmian Steamship Co., for which my firm is agent. These two operators are firmly committed to a substantial improvement over their excellent prewar services from both east and west coasts to Hawaii.

Matson inaugurated a freighter replacement program in 1939, ordering four C-3's at a cost of \$2,500,000 each for the trade between Hawaii and the Atlantic coast.

The company recently announced its intention to expand and improve its postwar freighter service to Hawaii. The company is disposing of all prewar freighters and will replace them with a new fast fleet of standard design. The ships of this fleet will be operated on regular schedules with more frequent service to the Pacific Northwest and southern California than was possible before the war. Each of the new ships, for example, will have approximately 50,000 cubic feet of refrigerated space, the fleet providing three times the prewar capacity for this class of cargo. This means the company is keeping abreast of developments in the frozen foods field and will be in a position to supply the demand for these delicacies which is rapidly developing here and elsewhere.

A fleet of new but slower vessels will provide an expanded service for lumber and other heavy cargoes from the Pacific Northwest.

Matson's postwar freighter service with the faster ships will comprise four direct routes to Hawaii from the mainland, as follows:

1. Weekly sailings from Los Angeles.
2. Weekly sailings from San Francisco.
3. Fortnightly sailings from Seattle, Tacoma, and Portland.
4. Weekly sailings (in conjunction with Isthmian Steamship Co.) from the Atlantic seaboard with regular calls at Gulf ports.

Compared with prewar schedules, Matson sailings from Los Angeles will be doubled, and from Pacific Northwest ports will be increased about 50 percent. A total of 130 regular sailings annually in each direction is planned between Hawaii and the five principal Pacific Coast ports. This schedule will provide approximately 40 percent more dry cargo capacity than the estimated postwar volume at the time we resume service.

The speed of the new ships will cut sailing time to Hawaii as follows:

From—	Prewar	Postwar
California ports.....	7 to 11 days.....	5½ days.
Pacific Northwest ports.....	7 to 11 days.....	6 days.
Atlantic ports.....	30 days.....	18 days.

Another point should be brought up in connection with surface transportation on this occasion when the Americanism of Hawaii and its contributions to the Union are under consideration. That is the accomplishment during the war years of the fleet of vessels which the islands have built up under the American flag.

The passenger vessels of the Matson Navigation Co. and Oceanic Steamship Co. alone carried more than 750,000 troops to and from battlefields as remote as Naples and Leyte, Port Moresby and Karachi.

Matson's record in World War II is one in which the people of Hawaii as well as the company can take genuine pride. Services and facilities developed during peacetime by Matson in close cooperation with the people of Hawaii made available to the Nation when war came a fleet of cargo and passenger ships and a reserve of experienced seamanship that have contributed substantially to victory in both Atlantic and Pacific.

There is a new very important factor in the island transportation picture—trans-Pacific aviation. The air age out here gained its initial stimulus from the financial support of the people of the Territory who participated in the Pan American venture and proved it to be a practical operation even before the war.

On these beginnings, the famous Air Transport Command and Naval Air

Transport Service operations were built. In the closing period of the war more than 35,000 passengers were being flown each month between the Pacific coast and Hawaii in 10 to 15 hours, dictated by weather conditions. More than 2,000 flights a month were being operated on a scheduled basis by these services—some indication of the certain development of commercial operation now that the war is won.

Pan American Airways, enjoying an earlier certificate of the Board, has already resumed commercial operation and the Board will probably act to authorize others to enter this field.

Careful polls and surveys of past travelers have shown that at least one-third of the traveling public in the postwar era will want to use steamer facilities in one direction and air facilities in the other. Matson has emphasized the importance of combination sea and air service in its application to the Civil Aeronautics Board which is now considering the application of a number of commercial carriers for the establishment of regularly scheduled passenger flights over this route.

This type of business will not be fully developed unless both types are offered under a single management, for the obvious reason that no interest will make the expenditures and efforts necessary to promote this type of travel unless it enjoys patronage in both directions; and secondly, because of the facility and convenience to the passenger in making round-trip arrangements, reservations, ticketing, etc., through a single responsible company and with a minimum of effort by the passenger.

Our position is that irrespective of how many individual air lines are operating, the field will not have been covered unless a regional operator offering the combination service is also available.

Civic groups of many kinds throughout the country have passed resolutions opposing discrimination against American flag steamship companies in the allocation of overseas air routes. We believe the day will surely come when the CAB will recognize the importance of sea-air service and will permit the enterprise which was developed by these islands, and which in turn helped develop them to cultivate the field it has plowed. Here again is an argument for statehood. Government agencies are properly responsive to votes in such matters, but Hawaii has none.

Because of their unique geography and their distance from the mainland of the United States, the islands of the Territory can only advance economically and socially as their transportation facilities permit. I am confident that you will find from your inquiry that in the air, on the surface or on the city streets, Hawaii's transportation services are equal to or an improvement upon the transportation facilities available in any communities of the same size in any of the 48 States.

Whatever the decision of the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Congress as to the right of Territorially-owned transportation companies to expand in the trade which they have developed, it is certain that air transport will eliminate the last possible argument that distance disbars the Territory from statehood.

Transportation is, after all, measured by time. It must be obvious to all that Hawaii is closer to the seat of government under present transportation conditions than all but the immediately adjacent States were when Washington was first established as the Capital of the United States.

The various companies which have applied for CAB permits have agreed that 10¼ hours will be about the average flight time when the new planes begin operation. This means travel times of 11½ hours to Los Angeles, 14 hours to Portland, 19 hours to Chicago, and 22½ hours to the Eastern seaboard. The speed with which you gentlemen arrived here for this hearing is a good illustration of Hawaii's new proximity to continental United States.

As one of our local air line executives has pointed out, Hawaii is closer in hours to the mainland today than it was in days at the turn of the century.

On the surface, new Matson freighters will soon deliver cargoes from New York to Honolulu within a shorter time than conventional coastwise carriers deliver freight from the same port to San Francisco.

The airplane and modern surface vessels have eliminated any barriers to statehood which may have existed in the early days when barks of the Matson Line took 20 days to come to Honolulu.

Just as sail turned to steam and as surface transportation now looks to the air, so Hawaii advanced from independent kingdom to Territory and now aspires to statehood.

Thank you for giving me this opportunity to tell the story.

ADDENDUM

The foregoing concludes my formal statement. I should like, however, to comment in a supplementary way on some of the loose and unsubstantiated charges which you have heard in testimony and perhaps informally elsewhere.

Matson-Dollar agreement.—In support of allegations that Matson has a monopoly of the steamship business to and from Hawaii and has taken advantage of that alleged monopoly to stifle competition, reference has been made to the so-called Matson-Dollar agreement.

This agreement is cited in an exhibit already presented to this committee (Big Five Monopoly in Hawaii, pp. 21 and 22) as evidence that the Matson Navigation Co. used this means to kill the competition in the shipping business.

So that your committee will be better able to weigh the truth of that allegation we present the following historical review of the agreement which was signed by Matson and the Dollar Steamship Co. May 27, 1930, and which was effective until August 17, 1938, when it was declared invalid by the United States Maritime Commission:

In July, 1929, Matson entered the Orient trade for the first time with two ships on a direct run from San Francisco to Manila, establishing a service that cut several days from the schedule then maintained by Dollar ships operating over another route. Subsequently Dollar entered two ships on the shorter run paralleling Matson, and operated these ships at a loss to compete with Matson.

Matson obtained a postal subsidy for its service, and thereafter Dollar approached Matson to discuss possible arrangements for less competitive operations in the Pacific. The result was the Matson-Dollar agreement, approved by the United States Shipping Board, predecessor of the United States Maritime Commission.

Under this arrangement Matson withdrew from the oriental trade entirely and agreed to pay Dollar 50 percent of its revenues from all passenger business that might be realized from the occasional Matson cruises to the Orient.

In turn, Dollar agreed to pay Matson 50 percent of its revenue from all passenger and freight which Dollar ships might carry to and from Hawaii and the mainland. An exception was the business which Dollar might handle at the written request of Matson whenever the latter's own facilities were unable to accommodate all passengers or freight offered; in that event Dollar would receive the full rate and no commission would apply.

The purpose of the agreement was not merely to protect Matson interests in the Hawaiian trade, but also to protect Dollar's position in the Oriental service and to build up the American merchant marine generally.

When the United States Maritime Commission took over the Dollar operations in 1936, it reviewed the Matson-Dollar agreement in connection with an exhaustive analysis of the virtually bankrupt company, and apparently concluded that as an agency of the Federal Government it could not carry out the terms of this arrangement with Matson.

On August 17, 1938, the Commission ruled that the agreement was invalid and that no further payments should be made to Matson. The latter company did not dispute the legal authority of the Commission to terminate the agreement, which had been approved by its predecessor, the United States Shipping Board, but Matson did contest the authority of the Commission to halt payments on the unpaid balance then due Matson for the period from 1936 to the date of cancellation.

Matson's position on this point subsequently was upheld by the Commission itself in 1940 when the Commission struck from its earlier findings all reference to "further payments being prohibited", and referred the question of the validity of Matson's financial claims to the courts, where the case was settled by a payment of all of the unpaid balance.

Up until the Dollar interests were taken over by the Maritime Commission in 1936 there is no evidence that Dollar or any other interests ever protested the terms of the agreement, and the attorney's briefs on which the Commission based its rulings commented that there was no evidence that the arrangement was detrimental to Hawaii.

It also appears from the evidence assembled by the Maritime Commission in connection with their investigation of this agreement that the agreement itself was not a major factor contributing to Dollar's financial decline. In fact, Dollar probably would not have survived as long as it did, had not Matson under terms of the agreement refrained from extending its own lines to the Orient.

That the Maritime Commission itself held the Matson integrity and managerial ability in high esteem, despite the ruling on the agreement, is evidenced by the fact that in 1938, shortly after the Commission terminated the agreement, the Commission invited Matson to manage and operate the Dollar Line on a cost basis without profit for a limited period.

Another favorite argument cited by those who accuse Matson of using monopolistic practices to the detriment of Hawaii is the case of the Lost Angeles Steamship Co.

This company, from about 1922 to 1931, provided Los Angeles and the southern California area with direct service to Hawaii, whereas Matson service at that time was primarily from San Francisco and ports in Oregon and Washington. The Los Angeles company was carrying a very substantial number of passengers to and from Hawaii, but somewhat less than that carried by Matson. The Los Angeles ships were ex-German prizes converted into passenger steamers.

To maintain the Los Angeles service, it would have been necessary to replace the old ships with new equipment, but the owners of the company did not want to put out the amount of capital required for an adequate replacement program. Instead, they approached Matson with the proposal the service be merged with Matson's. Matson agreed and a merger was effected with the result that in 1931 Matson passenger service was extended to include Los Angeles. The public lost nothing—but gained from this arrangement inasmuch as Los Angeles and travelers who wished to use that southern gateway were served by more regular and frequent sailings of large, modern vessels without any depreciation of the frequency or quality of service from San Francisco.

Matson has consistently taken the position through the 64 years of its close association with Hawaii's commercial and cultural development that it is responsible for maintenance of a caliber of service above and beyond immediate business requirements. How Matson's appreciation of this responsibility has served to benefit Hawaii in times of crisis is illustrated by the company's experience in World War I.

At the outset of that war there were abundant opportunities for Matson to divert its ships to other trades where there were three or four times the revenue possibilities available in the Hawaiian service. The American-Hawaiian Steamship Co., one of Matson's competitors at that time, did respond to the lure of more lucrative business in the war zones and withdrew its ships from the Hawaiian trade entirely. Matson, however, continued to carry Hawaiian cargo at peacetime rates until its ships were requisitioned by the United States Shipping Board. The Government asked Matson to act as agents for the requisitioned ships and to continue to carry essential cargo between the islands and the Pacific coast. At the same time the Government instructed Matson to double the freight charges over previous rates.

The charge has been made that Matson uses its favorable position in relation to the Hawaiian trade to maintain unreasonably high freight and passenger rates; also, that Matson discriminates against the small shipper and favors big business.

Matson freight and passenger rates have always been fair and equitable for the character of service given. They have compared very favorably with rates charged for similar service in other parts of the world. All rates are filed with and approved by the Maritime Commission. If any rate seems to any shipper to be too high, he may apply for and get a review and adjustment, by arbitration, if necessary.

To illustrate, a local lumber dealer some years ago applied to the Maritime Commission for changes in the minimum quantities and contract rates on lumber. After a hearing, his request was granted.

A basic policy of Matson, laid down many years ago by Captain Matson and the shipper-owners of the early years and continued to the present time, is to treat all customers on an equal basis. As a common carrier we are of course required by law to treat everyone alike and we have been very careful to do so. You can appreciate that in an insular community the repercussions from any other policy would quickly bring any transgressor back into line.

Pressure from the stockholders of Matson who are also interested in sugar, pineapples, and other island industries has always been for lower rates. From a financial standpoint, direct gains from lower freight rates would be more substantial and immediate than would any indirect gains from higher dividends on Matson stock resulting from higher rates.

Incidentally, 52 percent of Matson's stock is owned by the people of Hawaii. The remainder is distributed throughout the mainland.

Still another false charge is that Matson is or has been a party to an alleged conspiracy to discourage small farming in Hawaii so that the volume of refrigerated produce imported from the mainland can be maintained at high profit levels.

The argument is advanced that Hawaii can make its best and most effective contribution to the economy of the Nation by concentration on production of sugar and pineapple, the two major crops for which it is naturally best suited, at the same time depending for its fruits and vegetables on mainland producing areas which are better equipped to supply them.

Regardless of the merits of this argument, prices and consumer preferences are, as always, vitally important factors. If island-produced vegetables cost more to grow, obviously they cannot compete. The Matson freight rate neither favors nor discourages the importation of mainland produce. But consumer preferences have definitely favored it.

As for the attitude of the Matson Navigation Co., we would welcome a development in the islands whereby locally grown produce would be available for shipment to mainland markets in off seasons, thus providing cargo for refrigerated space otherwise unused on east-bound voyages.

Summarizing, gentlemen, the charges of monopoly, high rates, discrimination, and conspiracy arise to plague enterprise in Hawaii just as they do on the mainland. Perhaps, in a democracy, we would have cause to worry if such charges were not made. Like a griping army, possibly they indicate a healthy condition.

In Matson's particular circumstances, the record shows that we have had surprisingly few formalized complaints calling for definite action either by the company or by the Government, especially considering the hundreds of thousands of passengers and the millions of tons of freight carried in the last half century. We have had talk based on misinformation or lack of information—yes; action based on facts—no. We're proud of that record.

The point in reviewing these charges here is simply that the falsehoods, if allowed to go unrefuted, may influence Congress in its future deliberations on statehood for Hawaii.

Sight must not be lost of the fact that Hawaii's remarkable development in a relatively short span of years has been due in no small measure to excellent transportation especially tailored to suit the needs of the Territory. If Hawaii is ready for statehood today—and we believe unqualifiedly that it is—the responsibility may be undertaken with full confidence that Hawaii's sea and air commerce are abreast of the times and a bulwark to the Nation.

Thank you.

STATEMENT No. 23

(See p. 478)

STATEMENT OF S. N. CASTLE

HONOLULU, T. H., January 13, 1946.

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE,

Chairman House Territorial Subcommittee, Iolani Palace, Honolulu, T. H.

DEAR SIR: I have read, with interest, the testimony submitted to your committee re statehood. I note, however, at least one point which no one has, at least to date, brought out, viz, Hawaii has the tradition of "self-government," both under the provisional government and the republic of Hawaii—the last particularly.

Historically, the Republic was probably the best government the world has ever seen—and there are still "old timers" who can give details. Judge Robertson can.

In passing, if it hadn't been for the diffidence—self-deprecation of Judge Dole et al.—Hawaii would probably have been admitted as a State directly as was Texas (vide original debate and Secretary Cluney's statement.)

Respectfully,

S. N. CASTLE.

STATEMENT No. 24

(See p. 478)

STATEMENT OF SOPHIE JUDD COOKE

KAUNAKAKAI, MOLOKAI, T. H., January 14, 1946.

Hon. Representative LARCADE,

Chairman, Hawaii Statehood Committee, Honolulu, T. H.

DEAR SIR: For identification, I am a daughter of Chief Justice Alberly Francis Judd, LL. D., of Hawaii, and a granddaughter of Dr. Gerrit Parmele Judd, medical missionary to Hawaii from the American Board of Foreign Missions who came to these islands in 1928 from Paris Hill, N. Y. Dr. Judd's wife, Laura Fish, was from Washington, Conn.

I was born in Honolulu and have lived on Molokai for the past 37 years. Was educated in Boston and at Farmington, Conn., after attending Punahou School.

It, to me, is unthinkable that American citizens who have for many years paid taxes into the Federal Treasury do not have the privilege of voting for their Federal officials! It is very un-American. "Taxation without representation" is the crux of this whole matter; it is what our forefathers fought for, among them my own forefathers. Hawaii has certainly proved that she is eligible for statehood for these many years; compare the condition of some of the States at the time of their being made States; they are not comparable. Even now at this day, Hawaii can take her place in patriotism for the United States of America among the others, as witness our grand reports from all the war drive funds.

You are used to calling the Jews and Germans of Chicago and the Italians of New York "good Americans" and I say you can easily get used to the Americans here.

Either make us a rightful State or else reduce us to the position of Puerto Rico and absolve us from paying Federal taxes.

SOPHIE JUDD COOKE.

STATEMENT No. 25

(See p. 513)

STATEMENT OF ROY A. VITOUSEK

TERRITORIAL CENTRAL COMMITTEE,
REPUBLICAN PARTY OF HAWAII,
Honolulu I, T. H., January 15, 1946.

Hon. HENRY LARCADE,

Chairman, Subcommittee of Territorial Committee, House of Representatives, Congress of the United States, Investigating Statehood for Hawaii.

DEAR SIR: The other day a witness appearing before you named John Stokes, made the statement that in the last Territorial election Richard K. Kimball, a Democrat running for the house of representatives, fourth district, was elected in 1942 and defeated in 1944 by racial voting by American citizens of Japanese ancestry. I have computed and submit herewith for each precinct in the fourth representative district votes cast, the votes received by Mr. Kimball, and percentage of votes cast received by Mr. Kimball at both the primary and general elections of 1942 and 1944.

Amongst those familiar with the political situation in the fourth representative district, it is conceded that the voters in the sixth, thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth precincts are predominately of Caucasian ancestry. As a matter of fact these precincts are politically known as the "silk-stocking precincts." It is common knowledge that the larger concentration of American citizen voters of Japanese ancestry are in the eighth and eleventh precincts with the nineteenth precinct having approximately one-half of the voters being American citizens of Japanese ancestry and the others mostly American citizens of Hawaiian ancestry. The tenth precinct was Mr. Kimball's home precinct and the voters are largely of Caucasian ancestry with a fair number of Hawaiians and with very few citizen voters of Japanese ancestry.

Mr. Kimball was elected in the 1942 election and defeated in the 1944 election. The comparison of the votes received by him in last mentioned eight precincts are as follows:

Precinct	1942					
	Primary			General		
	Vote cast	Vote received	Percent of votes cast	Vote cast	Vote received	Percent of votes cast
6	486	135	28	653	289	44
8	616	216	35	833	364	44
10	422	187	44	540	345	65
11	701	261	37	948	429	45
13	419	102	24	584	228	39
14	581	139	24	768	325	42
15	555	153	28	716	324	45
19	478	193	40	640	316	49
	1944					
	Vote cast	Vote received	Percent of votes cast	Vote cast	Vote received	Percent of votes cast
	Vote cast	Vote received	Percent of votes cast	Vote cast	Vote received	Percent of votes cast
6	626	211	34	812	280	34
8	768	248	32	1,081	351	32
10	523	254	48	677	323	47
11	870	278	31	1,280	354	27
13	504	168	33	653	197	30
14	740	245	33	930	294	31
15	693	255	36	881	310	35
19	553	167	30	528	274	51

It is submitted that the records show that his vote fell off generally between 1942 and 1944 and that his election and his defeat cannot be placed upon any particular racial group.

Very truly yours,

ROY A. VITOUSEK, *Chairman.*

Vote for Richard K. Kimball, primary and general election, 1942

Precinct	Primary			General		
	Vote cast	Vote received	Percent of votes cast	Vote cast	Vote received	Percent of votes cast
1	751	258	34	939	470	50
2	547	194	35	711	369	52
3	482	190	39	624	319	51
4	378	106	28	522	243	46
5	571	222	39	774	387	50
6	486	135	28	653	289	44
7	652	218	33	835	479	57
8	616	216	35	833	364	44
9	375	136	37	502	274	54
10	422	187	44	540	345	65
11	701	261	37	948	429	45
12	390	152	39	533	286	54
13	419	102	24	584	228	39
14	581	139	24	768	325	42
15	555	153	28	716	324	45
16	503	189	37	658	344	52
17	359	135	38	473	225	47
18	297	138	44	453	251	55
19	478	193	40	640	316	49
20	215	91	42	297	155	52
21	359	149	41	482	291	60
22	248	97	39	326	171	52
23	342	138	40	459	244	53
24	266	105	39	363	198	54
25	477	155	35	657	324	49
26	666	273	41	892	463	52
27	420	142	34	552	294	53
28	327	118	36	422	215	51
29	518	176	34	712	316	44
30	495	181	36	640	337	52
31	423	155	36	579	277	48
32	218	99	45	283	160	56
33	464	195	42	658	346	52
34	547	208	38	750	393	52
	15,548	5,616	35	20,779	10,451	50

Vote for Richard K. Kimball, primary and general election, 1944

Precinct	Primary			General		
	Vote cast	Vote received	Percent of votes cast	Vote cast	Vote received	Percent of votes cast
1	930	335	0.3602	1,154	415	0.35962
2	674	228	.3383	895	330	.3687
3	612	221	.3279	774	327	.4225
4	459	157	.3420	597	234	.3920
5	777	220	.2831	1,061	416	.39208
6	626	211	.3425	812	280	.3448
7	718	226	.3148	959	358	.3733
8	768	248	.3229	1,081	351	.32469
9	528	228	.4318	682	306	.4487
10	523	254	.4857	677	323	.4771
11	870	278	.3195	1,280	354	.27656
12	495	163	.3293	645	227	.3519
13	504	168	.3333	653	197	.3017
14	740	245	.3311	930	294	.3161
15	693	255	.3680	881	310	.3519
16	628	219	.3487	789	286	.3625
17	433	145	.3349	533	210	.3940
18	366	149	.4071	506	236	.4664
19	553	167	.3019	528	274	.5189
20	256	92	.3598	340	149	.4382
21	413	164	.3971	537	238	.4432
22	279	85	.3046	347	154	.4438
23	401	129	.3217	548	214	.3905
24	324	120	.3704	395	196	.4962
25	566	183	.3233	731	265	.3625
26	748	244	.3262	958	392	.4092
27	542	188	.3469	673	254	.3774
28	444	156	.3514	790	306	.3873
29	746	235	.3150	998	321	.3216
30	549	182	.3315	789	319	.4043
31	525	166	.3162	675	276	.4089
32	274	96	.3506	360	149	.4139
33	621	234	.3768	860	365	.4244
34	717	256	.3570	985	404	.4102
	19,302	6,655	.34478	25,643	9,730	.37944

STATEMENT No. 26

(See p. 513)

STATEMENT OF MANASE MAKEKAU

KAUNAKAKAI, MOLOKAI, T. H.,
January 12, 1946.

Gentlemen of Congress, members of Hawaii Statehood Investigation Committee, my name is Manase Makekau, now occupying a homestead in the Hoolehua district of Molokai. I have been a homesteader for many years and have observed the operation and direction of the project and feel much can be done in improving the condition of the Hawaiian, here as well as throughout the Territory, generally. I would like to point out that the natives of these islands, Hawaiians, as a group, have not been able to acquire security.

Home owning by the Hawaiians is not a general situation, with the consequence that the security of owning one's own home does not prevail except in a very few cases. This situation, undoubtedly, was the motive of our great leader, and a Hawaiian, a man greatly loved and respected by all people who were privileged to know him, to secure from your honorable Congress the Rehabilitation Act which permits homesteading by the Hawaiian of half or more blood. This man's memory—Prince Kuhio Kalanianaʻole—will ever remain an influence for the better among our people.

Basic food requirements.—The Hawaiian requires taro with which to make poi, fish, and other sea foods, fruit and other locally raised products, in order to maintain a good standard of health. With little lands at their disposal on which to produce these requisites, lands adaptable to this effort, the health and security of a native living in the country of his birth finds it extremely difficult to compete

on an equal footing with many of the races depending on cheaper foods such as rice, potatoes, and many other imported basic required foods. This situation does not promote for good health or security. By creating fisheries on each island and allowing the general public to take the result of the effort would do much to relieve a glaring example of unconcern over our peoples' needs. Your committee observed a group of 30 families laboring with hand tools bucking a swamp with the ambition of grubbing out a spot on which to raise taro. Undoubtedly there is now in various warehouses much modern equipment which should be secured by the Homes Commission from the Federal agencies in charge of excess property which would allow modern methods be employed to satisfy this natural desire to procure foods needed so badly by natives in their own country. It is doubted that any race or group in our country today would show such love and devotion to the soil as was expressed by this group of 30 families by carrying on in the face of such great odds of success as was your opportunity. This was known as the Palaaui project to secure taro, but of a quality which would not allow it to be made into poi. It would have to be consumed as food much as our potatoes are prepared, by boiling.

Water.—It is urged that the Molokai Water Project be completed and that the water be allowed to flow directly to the lands now used as homesteads and that it be made available at once. Without an abundance of cheap water, which would allow irrigation, it will be difficult for the Hawaiian to take his place among his fellow men as a successful farmer. All semblance of influence foreign to the general benefit to a most loyal and ambitious group should be assured and the rights and interests of the Hawaiian should be a matter of concern of the Congress of the United States.

Lands in general.—It undoubtedly has come to the attention of the committee that there is very little land available to the general public. It is our contention that Hawaii needs the influence of a great middle class of homeowners which could exercise a healthful influence to the betterment of the majority if such a group could be established, and thereby dissipating any theory of being unqualified for full responsibility of exercising "full citizenship." Let's get the statehood.

STATEMENT No. 27

(See p. 516)

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR AND INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS TO THE CONGRESSIONAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII

STATISTICAL REPORT SUPPLEMENTING STATEMENT OF JANUARY 8, 1946, OF THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII

(Submitted by L. Q. McComas)

This statistical report is submitted as a supplement to the summary of department activities which was delivered by the Director of Labor and Industrial Relations to the members of the congressional Subcommittee on Statehood for Hawaii at its afternoon session, January 8, 1946. (Statement No. 12.) The committee members have been supplied with photostatic copies of the organization chart of the department (Exhibit No. 33A) and the annual report for 1944-45 (not filed with the record) in addition to 16 exhibits on subjects relating to labor in Hawaii, copies of which are made a part of this report. (Filed as Exhibits 11a-q.)

Also accompanying this report are copies of pamphlets containing the following labor laws under the jurisdiction of the department (not filed with the record):

1. Workmen's compensation law of Hawaii.
2. Unemployment compensation law of Hawaii.
3. Hawaii wage and hour law, child-labor law, apprenticeship law, and laws concerning payment of and deduction from wages.

The summary statement briefly reviewed the functions and activities of the department and sketched a history of the various labor laws of the Territory from 1935 through the 1945 legislature.

APPROPRIATIONS AND EXPENDITURES

The Committee on Statehood may be interested in the financial aspects of the administration of labor laws by the department of labor and industrial relations. Figures are quoted for the period January 1, 1940 (when the department began operations), to the close of the last fiscal year on June 30, 1945.

The grand total of appropriations for the department for the period stated is \$1,278,770, and the total expenditures \$1,224,652. Personal services accounted for 81.3 percent of the total expenses, current operating expenses 17.3 percent and equipment 1.4 percent.

Federal funds are provided for the administration of the unemployment compensation bureau, with the exception of the public employment service, for which the Territory matches funds allocated under the Wagner-Peyser Act, when the service is under Territorial administration.

The short table below summarizes receipts and disbursements of the bureau of unemployment compensation:

Social security funds-----	\$767, 044
Wagner-Peyser fund-----	30, 000
Veterans' Administration-----	3, 311
Total Federal funds-----	709, 355
Territorial funds-----	30, 000
Miscellaneous receipts-----	1, 502
Total for Bureau of Unemployment Compensation-----	740, 857
Expenditures by Bureau of Unemployment Compensation, 1940-45-----	697, 825

For the department, exclusive of the bureau of unemployment compensation, the Territorial Legislature had appropriated, up to June 30, 1945, the total of \$537,913. Expenditures amounted to \$526,227.

The 1945 legislature appropriated \$325,515 for the expenses of the department, exclusive of the unemployment compensation bureau, during the biennium beginning July 1, 1945.

Added to the previous appropriations of \$537,913, and \$30,000 for the employment service, this makes a total of \$893,428 from the treasury of the Territory for the administration of labor laws within the department's jurisdiction.

PERSONNEL

The organizational pattern of the department is shown on the chart. (Exhibit No. 33A.) There are 88 authorized paid positions in the department, 46 for the bureau of unemployment compensation, and 42 for the department other than the bureau. The long period of practically nonexistent unemployment permitted substantial reduction in the clerical staff of the bureau, which now has only 29 positions filled. Thirty-two of the 42 positions authorized for the other sections of the department are filled at present.

BUREAU OF WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION

This bureau, with a staff of four persons, handles the many details incident to the administration of a law which now covers 6,555 employing units. This figure, reported January 1, 1946, represents a 45 percent increase in coverage since the 1st of January 1940, when about 4,500 units were reported.

Approximately 82,000 industrial injuries have been reported to the bureau, during the 6 years in which it has been a part of the department. During the fiscal year 1940-41, 17,205 injuries were reported, but the succeeding years have shown considerable decrease, due to the transfer of many Territorial workers from private industries covered by the Hawaii law to Federal employment, which is under United States employees' compensation law. The return of workers to private employment upon completion of war projects is already showing up in the number of injuries reported to the Territorial bureau, the total for the second half of 1945 being 17 percent greater than for the first half.

The records of appeals taken from awards made by the director indicates the care with which adjudications are made. Only 43 appeals have been filed from an aggregate of more than 3,300 awards. Payment of compensation, in-

cluding medical, hospital and burial expenses, totaled \$3,092,607 from January 1940 to the end of 1945.

The director's statement mentioned only the highlights of the Hawaii law, and suggested that the committee study photostats of charts, which are furnished with this present report, depicting various phases of workmen's compensation legislation in the States and in Hawaii. (Exhibits 84 A, B, C, D, E, and F.)

Exhibit 11-A gives very briefly the principal provisions of this law.

The bureau has a coordinating agreement with the vocational rehabilitation division of the department of public instruction and reports appropriate cases to that division. It also gives advice and counsel to disabled workmen obliged to change trades or professions because of physical handicaps.

DIVISION OF INDUSTRIAL SAFETY

The industrial safety engineer for the department works with employers constantly in an endeavor to promote industrial safety, and to improve working conditions in the Territory. During the past year he studied first hand various programs in operation in several states, and planned a long-range program to secure the cooperation of management in reducing the frequency rate of accidents.

Our division makes inspections of plants having contracts under the Walsh-Healey Act, under provisions of an agreement with the Wages and Hours and Public Contracts Division of the United States Department of Labor. The Division also worked closely with the office of the National Committee for Conservation of Manpower in War Industries.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION BUREAU

The committee members are asked to study the tabulations offered as exhibits 11-L and 11-M, in order to compare maximum and minimum benefits, duration periods, and wage qualifications established by the laws of Hawaii and the States, as of 1945. Repeating the brief statement made January 8th, our maximum weekly benefit payment is \$25 (the minimum is \$5), and maximum duration is 20 weeks in a benefit year, or a total of \$500, with qualifying wages in the base period of only \$750. We mentioned that the interest earned by our deposits in the unemployment compensation trust fund have been more than sufficient to meet our benefit obligations.

When the bureau became part of the department on January 1, 1940, there was a balance of \$4,913,907 in the trust fund. From that date to the end of December 1945, net contributions (total contributions minus refunds for credits discovered in audits by our accounting section) totaled \$12,647,111, and \$1,355,588 interest was earned. Benefits paid from January 1, 1940, to December 13, 1945, amounted to \$634,257. As of January 1, 1946, the balance to our credit in the unemployment compensation trust fund is \$18,282,339.

Beginning April 1, 1941, a Territorial employer's rate of contribution to the unemployment compensation trust fund has been in direct ratio to his benefit payment record. He becomes eligible for this merit rating after 3 years as an employer, and the rate of his payment is determined by the ratio the excess of his contributions over benefits charged to him bears to his average annual payroll for a 3-year period. The 1945 legislature reduced these ratios and rates for the third time since the original act was passed in 1937. As of January 1, 1946, an employer's rate on covered wages is as follows:

	Percent
If his excess is less than 4 percent of his average annual payroll.....	2.7
If such excess equals or exceeds 4 percent but is less than 6 percent of his average annual payroll.....	2.0
If such excess equals or exceeds 6 percent but is less than 8 percent of his average annual payroll.....	1.0
And no contributions payable, if such excess equals or exceeds 8 percent of his average annual payroll.....	.0

Exhibit 11-C lists the 4,327 employing units in various industrial categories reporting to the unemployment compensation board in January 1938, and 6,442 employers reporting to the bureau of unemployment compensation as of September 1945. (Reports are made quarterly and statistics for December are not yet available.)

The downward trend of unemployment in Hawaii is shown by the tabulation of benefits paid, annually, since the program began :

Amount of benefits paid, by areas

Year	Territory claimants	Interstate claimants	Total
1939	\$274, 248	\$12, 432	\$286, 680
1940	259, 661	17, 487	277, 148
1941	139, 569	20, 222	159, 791
1942	115, 563	43, 091	158, 654
1943	18, 779	9, 701	28, 478
1944	871	5, 625	6, 496
1945	3, 398	2, 545	5, 943

VETERANS READJUSTMENT ALLOWANCES

The bureau of unemployment compensation entered into an agreement with the Veterans' Administration, in September 1944, to act as its Hawaii agent in administering provisions of the "G. I. bill of rights" pertaining to readjustment allowances for unemployed and self-employed veterans.

The Selective Service office reports a total of 8,895 separations of men who designated Hawaii as their residence. A few of these men expect to remain on the mainland or go to the Philippines and other localities. About 8,300 will reside in the Territory. Up to the end of 1945, only 228 veterans have applied for readjustment allowances for unemployment, and only 135 have actually collected benefits. These averaged 3 weeks of payments each (\$58.91 average payment, total \$7,953). Eight self-employed veterans have been paid an average of \$78 each to make up a net income of \$100 monthly, as provided by the law. Altogether less than 2 percent of the men separated from the service have collected benefits in Hawaii.

BUREAU OF LABOR LAW ENFORCEMENT

Wage and hour division.—As stated briefly in our exhibit 11-A, the Hawaii wage and hour law covers men, women and children alike. The minimum hourly wage, throughout the Territory, is 40 cents, and overtime must be paid after 48 hours weekly. The law first became effective April 1, 1942. Since that date and up to the end of December 1945, the wage and hour division has inspected 5,150 establishments. It was found that 3,449 of these were covered under the law; their total covered employees were 26,267, and exempt employees 5,384. The division's cumulative report shows restitution as having been made by 1,438 establishments to 4,907 employees, with a total restitution of \$214,795. Of this total, 59 percent was for violation of the section of the law pertaining to minimum wages and 41 percent for violation of the section on overtime pay.

The division's work is made difficult by the lack of proper records, as 74 percent of the covered establishments inspected produced inadequate or incomplete payroll records. Thirty percent of the establishments had violated the minimum wage provisions and 27 percent the overtime compensation provisions.

The wage and hour staff also report their findings as to violations or other laws within the department's scope of activities, including the child labor, workmen's compensation and unemployment compensation laws.

The division has five inspectors for Oahu, and one each for Hawaii, Maui and Kauai. The Oahu staff will have to be increased to expedite 100 percent coverage of establishments on this island.

Child labor division.—The labor exhibits include a digest of the Hawaii child labor law—exhibit 11-B. We believe that comparison of its provisions with the legislation of the States will place Hawaii in a very favorable light. We also suggest that the committee ask the Children's Bureau of the United States Department of Labor for its opinion as to the enforcement of the law by the Territorial bureau.

We are giving you the certification totals for minors annually from 1940 to the end of 1945, first by the three major periods of the year, and, second, by the age groups of the minors certified. The division has issued 88,506 certifica-

tions: 37,643 for minors 15 years old and under, 48,746 for those 16 and 17 years of age, and 2,117 for the 18-19 year old group.

Certification of minors for employment by calendar years, 1940-45

	1940	1941	1942	1943	1944	1945
By work periods:						
January to March, inclusive.....	81	163	1,313	2,391	2,256	2,146
April to August, inclusive: Summer vacation registration, including cannery season.....	4,531	7,727	10,158	10,146	10,451	13,935
September to December, inclusive: Christmas vacation and pineapple field work.....	165	1,283	6,005	6,066	4,818	4,871
Total for year.....	4,777	9,173	17,476	18,603	17,525	20,952
By age groups:						
15 years and under.....	423	838	7,805	9,402	8,385	10,790
16 and 17 years.....	3,956	7,368	9,289	9,076	9,069	9,988
18 and 19 years.....	398	967	382	125	71	174
All age groups.....	4,777	9,173	17,476	18,603	17,525	20,952

¹ L. 1945 raised age for certification in agriculture from 14 to 16.

² L. 1941 raised age for certification from 16 to 18

BUREAU OF RESEARCH AND STATISTICS

The director's summary statement outlined the duties and powers of the bureau, which assembled all of the statistics on labor, filed with the committee as exhibits. Exhibits 11-D, E, and F include data on numbers of workers in industry, average weekly wages, and comparisons of weekly wages with mainland industrial workers. Data on the sugar and pineapple industries, prepared by the Hawaiian Sugar Planters Association and Pineapple Growers Association, on request of the bureau, are included as exhibits 11-G and 11-H.

The director of the employment service in Hawaii submitted estimates of total employment figures for January 1, 1946. A slight revision should be made in the total for government employment, due to more complete data from civil service offices. We are listing estimates of employment with percentages for each of the major groups.

Estimated Hawaii labor force, January 1946

	Percent	Number
All industries.....	100.0	190,725
Government.....	32.4	61,700
Federal, estimates civil service, revised.....	25.3	48,200
Territory, estimates civil service, revised.....	4.0	7,600
Counties, estimates civil service, revised.....	3.1	5,900
Private industry (all estimates by USES, except as noted).....	55.6	106,050
Sugar industry, manufacture and agriculture (HSPA, Jan. 5, 1946).....	12.8	24,500
Pineapple industry, manufacture and agriculture (USES and PGA) (latter for November 1945).....	4.4	8,500
Other agriculture.....	3.8	7,400
Construction and quarrying.....	3.4	6,600
Manufacturing, excluding sugar and pineapple.....	3.9	7,550
Transportation, communication, utilities.....	4.5	10,700
Wholesale and retail.....	12.0	23,000
Finance, insurance, real estate.....	1.5	3,000
Service industries.....	7.0	13,500
Miscellaneous, including fishing.....	6	1,300
Domestic service (estimate USES).....	2.1	4,075
Self-employed, family employed, agents and others (USES).....	9.9	18,900

In the cost-of-living field, you have been supplied with exhibits showing the earnings and spendings of Honolulu families, and explaining the establishment and maintenance of the Honolulu price index. The latest index, September 1945, was included. [Exhibits 11-I, J, and K.]

In order that you may compare the rate of increase in consumers' prices in Honolulu and on the mainland, the following shows the state of the two indexes in September 1945, using March 1943 as 100:

Consumers' price indexes, September 1945

[March 15, 1943=100]

	Honolulu	Mainland
All items.....	104.6	105.0
Food.....	101.6	101.4
Clothing.....	102.3	116.1
Rent.....	99.7	100.3
Fuel.....	99.8	103.1
Furnishings.....	103.7	117.9
Miscellaneous (goods and services).....	111.1	108.8

In August of 1945 the bureau forwarded to the Bureau of Labor Statistics in Washington prices on all goods and services in the Honolulu index, with code numbers for each as used by the United States Bureau, in order that comparison might be made of costs in Honolulu with mainland cities and especially with Los Angeles, which more nearly approximates the living conditions of Hawaii than any of the other cities of more rigorous climate. We have not as yet received a report on these comparisons, and therefore made a request to the bureau for some indications as to their findings, which might be presented to the statehood committee. The following reply was received on January 14, 1946:

"Preliminary index cost, Honolulu, March 1945, with cost in Los Angeles equal to 100. Food 134, clothing 105, other goods and services 122. Weighted total of these groups 125. Important items not included in comparison are rent, automobile, and other durable household equipment for which comparable data not available."

This bureau has a staff of three in addition to the assistant in charge. One of the most popular publications of the bureau is its semiannual directory of labor organizations in the Territory. Exhibit 11-O is merely a listing of the various locals. Our directory gives each local's mail address and its secretary, treasurer, or business agent. The February 1946 revision is now in process, with the cooperation of the local officials.

In order that you may know how the research material of the bureau is disseminated to interested persons, we are listing the present mailing list:

Groups	Total names	Cost of living	Labor Directory	Wage-hour	Annual report
Army and Navy.....	6	3	2	3	2
City and county governments.....	6	5	2	3	6
Citizens and civic organizations.....	33	12	6	5	14
Educational institutions.....	56	26	23	19	36
Employers.....	63	57	9	24	10
Employers (self-insurers).....	88				88
Federal Government.....	39	33	15	14	16
Insurance companies.....	26	1	1		24
Labor organizations.....	26	20	16	11	14
Labor organizations, locals.....	121		121		
Libraries and information.....	30	10	14	10	28
Publications.....	11	11	11	11	11
State and foreign governments.....	23	8	2	4	16
Territorial government.....	27	18	12	10	18
Territorial legislators.....	45				45
Department of Labor, Territory of Hawaii.....	26	17	17	17	26
Total.....	629.	221	251	131	333

APPRENTICESHIP

The apprenticeship division is the youngest of the department's branches, having been in operation only 3 years. It was particularly difficult to start this training program in the war period, when Hawaii's employers were so harassed by labor shortages that they were willing to overclassify and overpay

their workers simply to get the job done. It was difficult to convince young workers of the ultimate value of a long range training program at comparatively low wages when they saw large pay checks in the hands of their unskilled and inexperienced friends. We were fortunate in having as directors during this period two young men who were not only well qualified by their training, but possessed a genuine interest in the young people of Hawaii. Much promotional work was required in selling the program to both industry and worker. Military establishments had the majority of the apprentices reported in the first two annual reports of the division.

The trend toward apprenticeship in local industries has been particularly evident since VJ-day. The latest registration report shows a gratifying increase in the number of indentures by private concerns. In referring to report for 1944-45 it will be noted that the council dropped from its register the names of 238 apprentices in a military establishment which had deviated from its standards.

The Territorial director of apprenticeship works in close cooperation with men administering the Federal and State programs. In 1943 and again in 1945 the director was invited to attend training conferences in Washington and in several State capitals, and profited greatly by these opportunities to observe the methods and results of programs which have been in operation longer than our own.

As of December 31, 1945, the active file carried 303 apprentices. The program lost 96 to military service since its report for the last fiscal year; others dropped out, or were placed in the inactive file; but these losses were offset by 318 new registrations and 8 renewed indentures. The table below gives the numbers of apprentices in their respective trades, at the present time.

On active file December 31, 1945

Trade:		Trade—Continued	
Aircraft mechanic.....	0	Printer	0
Armament Machinist	1	Refrigeration Mechanic.....	12
Auto Mechanic	75	Refrigeration Plant Operator	0
Blacksmith-Welder	1	Sheetmetal Worker.....	13
Body-Fender Repairman.....	3	Structural Steel Worker.....	1
Carpenter	17	Trailer Builder.....	3
Diesel, Marine Mechanic.....	5	Tractor Mechanic.....	8
Electrician	60	Welder.....	17
General Mechanic.....	3	Dressmaker	10
Mechanic, Diesel.....	14	Cosmetician	27
Instrument Repairman.....	0	Tailor	1
Machinist	21	Upholsterer	3
Painter	0		
Plumber	8	Total	303

The interest of the local communities in the programs is maintained by calling upon qualified men and women to serve on our apprenticeship committees. These committees and their memberships are:

Territorial apprenticeship committees:		Territorial apprenticeship committees—Continued	
Mauí	11	Hawaiian Commercial and Sugar Co.....	10
Hawaii	8	City Welding Co.....	7
Kauai	8	Hawaiian Ordnance Depot.....	5
Kauai Planters' Association.....	3	Apprenticeship Council.....	9
Women in Industry.....	6		
Beauty Culture.....	6	Total	80
Dressmaking	7		

MEDIATION

Exhibit 11-P lists the labor disputes in Hawaii since January 1940, which have come to the attention of the department directly or through the daily press. The research bureau maintains a chronological record of such disputes, with the union and industry involved and the issues which are stated. It is not possible always to obtain accurate figures on numbers of workers involved or man-days lost; some employers do not have these figures; in some cases the men who quit do not return to the job; in other cases, the company has dis-

continued business as a result of stoppages. However, we were able to obtain statistics on the number of man-days lost in comparison with man-days available to the companies involved in stoppages during the war period—December 7, 1941, to August 14, 1945. These figures substantiate our statement that the war record of Hawaii's labor is an admirable one. Out of a total of 1,992,340 man-days available to these employers, only 3,840 man-days were lost by strikes, or about two-tenths of 1 percent. In comparison with the total man-days available in the territory during the stated period (using 311 working days a year as a factor) the percentage is infinitesimal—the man-days lost representing thirteen and ten one-thousandths of 1 percent of approximately 231,000,000 man-days.

Fifty-six disputes are recorded in our exhibit 11-P for the 6-year period. Work stoppage resulted in 37 cases and 19 were settled without cessation of work. The Mediation services of the department were offered in 31 cases and accepted in 22—in the remainder of the disputes the parties themselves resolved their issues or used the services of Federal mediation and conciliation agencies.

A tabulation of these 56 disputes, by industry and by major issue, may be of interest to the committee:

Labor disputes in Hawaii, 1940 to 1945

	No work stoppage	Work stoppage		No work stoppage	Work stoppage
By industry involved:			By major issue stated:		
Agriculture.....	1	1	Wages and/or hours.....	2	9
Quarrying.....		4	Wages, hours, and other issues.....	10	13
Construction.....	2	8	Wages, hours, and union issues.....	4	5
Manufacturing (dairy products, beverages).....	6	6	Union recognition or or- ganization.....		5
Trucking and stevedor- ing.....	6	7	Interunion issues.....		3
Public utilities.....			Discrimination, union member.....	1	1
Wholesale and retail trade.....	1	2	Discharge fellow worker.....	1	1
Service industries.....	3	4	Company regulations.....	1	
Government, Territory of Hawaii and municipal.....		5	Total.....	19	37
Total.....	19	37			

UNION ELECTIONS

The Department has conducted 13 consent elections in Hawaii; 3 of these elections were conducted as an agent of the NLRB, during the temporary absence of its local representative; 9 were handled by the Department at the request of the unions and/or companies involved, and a Department representative acted as an advisor in an election just completed under the auspices of the Hawaii Employment Relations Board. CIO unions have been on the ballot in 9 elections; AFL unions in 3, and the ballot in a recent election in Hilo included both CIO and AFL organizations.

The Department will be glad to furnish to the committee information which it may request on subjects concerning labor in Hawaii.

STATEMENT No. 28

(See p. 516)

TERRITORY OF HAWAII,
BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY,
Honolulu 1, January 16, 1946.

HAWAII EQUAL RIGHTS COMMISSION,
Iolani Palace, Honolulu, T. H.

GENTLEMEN: A question was raised during the testimony of C. G. Lennox on "Natural Resources of Hawaii" as to the ability of the Territory to produce its own requirements of fresh vegetables. The following data are submitted to show

that land area is available to produce a sufficient volume of fresh produce for territorial consumption if a steady market is assured and the competition of higher quality produce from mainland areas is removed. During 1945 practically no fresh-vegetable produce entered the Territory from the mainland for civilian consumption.

	1941	1945
Estimated acreage in truck crops ¹ -----	4, 655	6, 760
Estimated production in tons-----	18, 706	30, 102

¹ From statistical report of Diversified Agriculture in Hawaii—Prepared for 1946 statehood hearing.

A careful check was made on the actual distribution of produce grown on the islands of Kauai, Maui, and Hawaii by the Office of Food Production, O. C. D.

During the months of February through July 1945, the Navy received 49.1 percent of all produce shipped off these islands, the Army 20.2 percent and the civilian trade in Honolulu 30.7 percent. The 69.3 percent of the off-island produce used by the military was for hospitals, submarines, flight groups, and other combat groups where "morale foods" were essential.

Yours very truly,

COLIN G. LENNOX,
President, Board of Agriculture and Forestry.

STATEMENT No. 29

(See p. 516)

TERRITORY OF HAWAII,
BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY,
Honolulu 1, January 16, 1946.

HAWAII EQUAL RIGHTS COMMISSION,
Iolani Palace, Honolulu, T. H.

GENTLEMEN: We submit herewith answers to questions asked of C. G. Lennox during his testimony on the "Natural Resources of Hawaii" on January 8, 1946.

Question: What acreage is available for additional sugarcane lands?

Answer: The largest acreage recorded under sugarcane cultivation, or fallow lands which are to be returned to cane, was in 1933 when the crop first exceeded 1,000,000 tons. This was 257,661 acres. The total acreage in 1944 is 220,590 acres or a shrinkage of 37,071 acres due to quota restrictions, condemnation for military purposes, or lack of field labor. An ample supply of field labor, no quota restriction, and a higher price level for sugar would enable the resumption of cultivation of most of the area which has been abandoned.

There are other lands in Hawaii where sugarcane will grow but which are not economic to use under the price levels of the past 30 years. Their eventual usefulness for sugarcane cultivation is very unlikely.

Yours very truly,

COLIN G. LENNOX,
President, Board of Agriculture and Forestry.

STATEMENT No. 30

(See p. 516)

UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII,
Honolulu 10, T. H., January 18, 1946.

Memorandum to Congressional Committee on Statehood for Hawaii, Iolani Palace, Honolulu, T. H.

In further answer to Delegate Farrington's question as to the people on our university faculty who did war work, I wish to submit the following list.

GREGG M. SINCLAIR,
President, University of Hawaii.

Faculty

	University of Hawaii position	Service
(A) GOVERNMENT SERVICE		
David L. Crawford.....	President, University of Hawaii to June 30, 1942.	Bureau of Economic Warfare, Mexico.
Howry H. Warner.....	Director, Agricultural Extension Service.....	FEA. ¹
Paul Avery Gantt.....	Specialist in animal husbandry, Agricultural Extension Service.	FEA.
Ashley C. Browne.....	Horticulturist, Agricultural Extension Service.	FEA.
Richard Lyman.....	County agricultural agent, Agricultural Extension Service.	FEA.
Robert Carlisle Eckart.....	County agricultural agent, Agricultural Extension Service.	FEA.
Stephen B. Jones.....	Assistant professor, geography.....	State Department.
Felix Maxwell Keesing.....	Professor, anthropology.....	Office of Coordinator.
William H. Taylor.....	Associate professor, economics.....	Treasury Department.
John F. Embree.....	Associate professor, anthropology.....	OSS and OWI. ²
Gordon T. Bowles.....	Assistant professor, anthropology.....	OWI, State Department.
Harold St. John.....	Professor, botany.....	Quinine discovery, in Colombia.
Iwao Miyake.....	Assistant professor, physics.....	Radar School.
William E. Williamson.....	Instructor, political science.....	FBI. ³
Arthur E. Wyman.....	Associate professor, English.....	Red Cross and Entertainment Unit, U. S. Army.
Willard Wilson.....	Associate professor, English.....	Censorship Office.
Hubert E. Brown.....	Associate professor, health and physical education.	Social Security Office.
Lillian Gibson.....	Instructor, health and physical education.....	United Service Organizations.
Willard Henry Eller.....	Professor, physics.....	Radar School.
James W. Abel.....	Instructor, English.....	OCDA
Fred E. Armstrong.....	Professor, vocational education.....	Office Military Government.
Ralph C. Elliott.....	Associate specialist, agricultural economics. Agricultural Extension Service.	Office Military Government.
Christopher Gregory.....	Instructor, mathematics and engineering.....	U. S. Bureau of Standards.
Ervin Hicks Bramhall.....	Associate professor, physics and mathematics.....	Army Air Operations analyst.
Man Kwong Au.....	Graduate assistant in anthropology and sociology.	Civilian worker, Naval Air Station, P. H.
Reginald P. Gage.....	Adviser for veterans.....	Personnel work, U. S. Naval Air Station.
Marjorie Carter.....	Assistant, English.....	OCDA
Virginia Jones.....	Associate professor, public health nursing.....	Red Cross, Philippine Islands.
Charles A. Moore.....	Associate professor, philosophy.....	Censorship Office.
Laura S. Schwartz (Mrs. A. L. Korn).....	Associate professor, English.....	Censorship Office.
Gregg M. Sinclair.....	President, University of Hawaii.....	Censorship Office.
Ralph C. Hoerber.....	Associate professor, economics and business.....	Fuel Price Administration, S. F.
Ben Norris.....	Assistant professor, art.....	U. S. Navy Camouflage Service.
Charles H. Honzik.....	Psychologist, psychological and psychopathic clinic.	Army Psychological Research.
Elvin A. Hoy.....	Assistant professor, mathematics and engineering.	Federal Security Agency, Washington.
James Adrian Rademaker.....	Assistant professor, sociology.....	War Relocation Administration.
Tsumika Maneki.....	Assistant county agricultural agent, Agricultural Extension Service.	Office of Food Production.
Eva Metraux (Mrs. G. C. LeRoy).....	Instructor in French language.....	Censorship.
Joseph B. O'Tolle, Jr.....	Graduate assistant in chemistry.....	U. S. Engineers.
Martha Potgieter.....	Associate professor, home economics, associate nutritionist, Hawaii Agricultural Experiment Station.	U. S. Department of Agriculture.
Norman P. Sacks.....	Instructor, romance languages.....	Navy Censorship.
Robert L. Van Eseltine.....	Graduate assistant in history.....	U. S. Engineers.
Norman J. Wright.....	Instructor, english.....	Censorship.
George K. Yuen.....	Assistant in plant physiology, Hawaii Agricultural Experiment Station.	U. S. Engineers.
(B) MILITARY SERVICE		
Col. John Wesley Coulter.....	Associate professor, geography.....	Army.
MacEldin Trawick.....	Instructor in psychology.....	Army.
Gerald R. Kinnear.....	Treasurer of the University of Hawaii.....	Navy Supply.
Yasuo Baron Goto.....	Assistant in agricultural extension, Agricultural Extension Service.	Army.

¹ Foreign Economic Administration.² Office of Strategic Services and Office of War Information.³ Federal Bureau of Investigation.⁴ Office of Civilian Defense.

Faculty—Continued

	University of Hawaii position	Service
(B) MILITARY SERVICE—cont.		
Charles Scott Bouslog.....	Instructor, English.....	Army.
William M. Cade.....	Instructor, mathematics and engineering.....	Army Engineering.
Wilfred J. Holmes.....	Assistant professor, engineering.....	Captain, U. S. Navy.
Jerome K. Holmes.....	Instructor, chemistry.....	Chemical Warfare.
Hubert Everly.....	Instructor, education.....	USAFI. ¹
Wm. A. McCartney.....	Instructor, English.....	Signal Corps.
Earle Ernst.....	Assistant professor, English.....	U. S. Army.
R. Ray Scott.....	Associate professor, education.....	USAFI.
Robert C. Elliott.....	Instructor, English.....	Navy Communications.
Stanley S. Ballard.....	Assistant professor, physics; collaborator in soil chemistry.	Navy Bureau of Ordnance.
Donald Abbott.....	Instructor, education.....	Army.
David A. Akana.....	County agriculture agent, Agricultural Extension Service.	Jungle Training.
Richard K. Okamoto.....	Assistant health and physical education.....	Army.
Shigeo Okubo.....	Instructor, English and mathematics.....	Army.
James Y. Shigeta.....	Assistant county agent, Agricultural Extension Service.	Army.
Shiro Takei.....	Assistant economist, Agricultural Extension Service.	Army.
Takuma Tanada.....	Assistant in chemistry, Hawaii Agricultural Experiment Station.	Fort Snelling Interpreter School.
Spencer W. Tinker.....	Director, Aquarium.....	Captain, Army.
Warren Y. J. Yee.....	Assistant county agent, Agricultural Extension Service.	Army.
Ralph J. Wentworth-Rohr.....	Instructor, educational psychology.....	Army.
Henry Urashima.....	Laboratory attendant, Hawaii Agricultural Experiment Station.	Army.
Edward Fukunaga.....	County agricultural agent, Agricultural Extension Service.	Army interpreter.
Gardner Orson Hyer.....	County agricultural agent, Agricultural Extension Service.	Army Engineer.
Jushin Kaneshiro.....	County agricultural agent, Agricultural Extension Service.	Army.
Thomas Kaulukukui.....	Instructor, physical education.....	Army.
Norito Kawakami.....	Assistant county agent, Agricultural Extension Service.	Army.
Esther Lound.....	Instructor, English.....	Waves.
Kan Jung Luke.....	Instructor, economics.....	Army.
Kenichi Murata.....	Assistant economist, Agricultural Extension Service.	Army interpreter.
Ralph Yepmuku.....	Instructor, health and physical education.....	Army.
Thomas Blake Clark.....	Assistant professor, English.....	OWI, Army.
Olive C. Obee.....	Instructor, English.....	Waves.

¹ United States Armed Forces Institute.

STATEMENT No. 31

(See p. 516)

STATEMENT OF C. NILS TAVARES, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII, RELATING TO THE 2-PERCENT TAX (COMPENSATION AND DIVIDENDS TAX, CHAPTER 98, REVISED LAWS OF HAWAII, 1945)

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

The 2-percent tax¹ is imposed on compensation paid to an employee by an employer for personal services performed within the Territory. The tax applies irrespective of the permanent place of residence of the employee. Also, the fact that the employer makes up the pay roll and issues the pay checks at a place of business outside the Territory is immaterial. The place where the services are performed is controlling. The tax also applies to dividends.

Section 5504, Revised Laws of Hawaii, 1945, allows 75 percent of the amount paid under chapter 98, Revised Laws of Hawaii, 1945 (the 2-percent-tax law), to be credited against the amount of net income tax which otherwise would be due. This credit is sufficient to absorb the net income tax of employees. Persons in

¹ Imposed by ch. 98, Revised Laws of Hawaii, 1945.

business (not employed by others) pay a gross income tax of $1\frac{1}{2}$ percent on their entire volume of business² and pay the net income tax as well.

OBJECTIONS MADE BY WITNESSES

Robert England, Oscar Smith, and John W. MacFadyen, appearing as opposition witnesses at the evening hearing, January 15, 1946, were all civilian employees of the United States Navy, employed in the navy yard. They made the following objections to the tax:

1. That they had no representation in the legislature which imposed the tax, being nonresidents.
2. That they have to pay the tax in their home States as well.
3. That as they reside in Federal reservations which are cared for by the Federal Government, they receive no benefit from the tax.
4. That they are under contract and cannot leave without forfeiting return passage, and hence cannot avoid the tax, also that they were not informed of the tax by the Navy when hired.

THE TAX LAW IS VALID

The first two objections made by the witnesses relate to the fact that they are nonresidents, being citizens of other States. The third rests on the fact that while in Hawaii they work and have their places of abode on Federal reservations, also on the claim that no benefits are received from the tax. The fourth really is a complaint that insufficient information was furnished by the Navy prior to signing up these persons to come to Hawaii. This fourth point accordingly presents no issue as between the Territory and these persons and will not be further considered.

As to the first three points it is well settled that they present no objection to the validity of the tax. The cases are summarized in *Yerian v. Territory* (130 Fed. 2d 786 (CCA 9, 1942)), as follows:

There is no merit in appellant's contention that because he was not domiciled in Hawaii, the Territorial Legislature had no jurisdiction to tax his compensation. Appellant arrived in Hawaii in November 1939. He was there during the entire month of December 1939—the month in which he earned and received the compensation upon which the tax here involved was assessed. He was there when the assessment was made and, so far as the record shows, is still there. Whether or not he had or has his domicile in Hawaii is immaterial (*Shaffer v. Carter*, 252 U. S. 37, 49-59, 40 S. Ct. 221, 64 L. Ed. 445; *Travis v. Yale & Towne Mfg. Co.*, 252 U. S. 60, 75, 40 S. Ct. 228, 64 L. Ed. 460; *Haavik v. Alaska Packers Ass'n.*, 263 U. S. 510, 44 S. Ct. 177, 68 L. Ed. 414).

Nor is it material, if true, that appellant will derive no benefit from the expenditure of moneys realized from the tax imposed by the Welfare Act. Jurisdiction to impose a tax does not depend upon the receipt by the taxpayer of a benefit therefrom (*Thomas v. Gay*, 169 U. S. 264, 280, 18 S. Ct. 340, 42 L. Ed. 740; *Gromer v. Standard Dredging Co.*, 224 U. S. 362, 371, 32 S. Ct. 499, 56 L. Ed. 801; *St. Louis & Southwestern R. Co. v. Nattin*, 277 U. S. 157, 159, 48 S. Ct. 438, 72 L. Ed. 830; *Carley & Hamilton v. Snook*, 281 U. S. 66, 72, 50 S. Ct. 204, 74 L. Ed. 704, 68 A. L. R. 194; *Nashville, C. & St. L. Ry. v. Wallace*, 288 U. S. 249, 268, 53 S. Ct. 345, 77 L. Ed. 730, 87 A. L. R. 1191; *Carmichael v. Southern Coal & Coke Co.*, 301 U. S. 495, 521-525, 57 S. Ct. 868, 81 L. Ed. 1245, 109 A. L. R. 1327; *Inter-Island Steam Navigation Co. v. Territory of Hawaii*, 305 U. S. 306, 314, 59 S. Ct. 202, 83 L. Ed. 189). "A tax is not an assessment of benefits" (*Carmichael v. Southern Coal & Coke Co.*, supra; *Inter-Island Steam Navigation Co. v. Territory of Hawaii*, supra).

Taxing jurisdiction exists within the Federal reservations as well as elsewhere in the Territory, being founded not only on court decisions but also on the express provisions of the Buck Act, 54 Stat. 1059, c. 787, sections 2 (a) and 6 (d).

THE TAX LAW IS FAIR

An increase in population necessarily increases the cost of government, whether or not the immigrant worker becomes a citizen of the State to which he comes. The population of the Territory increased from 414,991 in 1939 to 502,122 (civilians only) in 1945, an increase of 87,131 or 21 percent of the 1939 figure.

² This tax is imposed by ch. 101, Revised Laws of Hawaii, 1945.

As this increase was entirely in the city and county of Honolulu (the other counties suffering a decrease), and as defense work started on Oahu in a substantial way in 1939, it is fair to assume that this increase was due largely to in-migration of workers and that they represent a very substantial part of the present population.

The appropriations for the health department exemplify the increased burden on local government imposed by the above-described situation. During the 1939-41 biennium the general appropriation for the health department was \$745,159; for the 1941-43 biennium, \$1,189,056; for the 1943-45 biennium, \$1,708,155; and for the 1945-47 biennium, \$2,140,868. The above figures indicate the expanded needs of the health department to meet the increased health problems in this community. Some of these problems are due to the overcrowding of housing facilities and eating and drinking places; this overcrowding is particularly serious in respect to the control of communicable diseases such as tuberculosis, cold, typhus fever, and dengue fever.

In many instances the effect of the presence of the war workers in the community can be directly traced. Thus, Dr. M. F. Haralson, former president of the board of health, on September 11, 1941, in a letter to Mr. S. L. Platt, special secretary of the Chamber of Commerce of Honolulu, stated that of the last 100 admissions to the mental hygiene clinic up to the time of that report, 30 were connected with defense activities and had been in Hawaii less than 1 year. Fifteen of the 30 were defense workers or members of their families, 8 were Navy officers, 2 were Navy enlisted men, 1 was from the Army, and 4 were mainland "floaters" attracted to the Territory by defense jobs. Since the date of that report there has been a tremendous increase in the migrant population of the Territory.

In tuberculosis control, the chest clinic of the health department has repeatedly examined and recommended treatment and follow-up of many war workers referred by physicians and others. The mobile X-ray unit of the health department has been used to X-ray the chests of USED employees and workers in the naval housing area and Hawaii Air Depot area.

With respect to housing it repeatedly has occurred that workers brought in for Federal projects and furnished with accommodations in barracks have moved into town taking up housing accommodations in the city. Although this is a problem for which the Federal Government is responsible it has not yet met the situation. Meanwhile the Territory has expended, or encumbered for contracts now being performed, the sum of \$725,000 for the local housing committee and for temporary housing. This expenditure cannot be amortized over the period of the life of the buildings because the projects are temporary.

With respect to crime control the effect of in-migrant war workers is obvious. Not only do they constitute a substantial part of the population, but moreover they are not a stable element. This is necessarily true of any migrant group. Insofar as there is any relation between the domicile of the persons present within the Territory and the problems of crime control, the cost of government in this regard is increased, not decreased, by the impermanent character of this portion of the population.

Other costs of government which are increased by the presence of nonresident workers are for fire protection, public parks, libraries, roads, and in fact every cost of government. From 1940 to 1945 the cost of government increased with the increase of population. In 1940 the per capita cost was \$79.91, in 1945 it was \$96.02. This represents an increase of 20.16 percent in the per capita cost, which is accounted for by the rise in prices and wages.

The foregoing arguments apply equally to Federal employees residing on Federal reservations. Congress previously provided for taxation of their earnings by the Buck Act (54 Stat. 1059, c. 787, s. 2 (a)), and the position then taken was sound. So far as the employee is concerned it makes no difference to him whether certain services are furnished him by the local government or by the Federal Government; that is a question which concerns only Congress and the several States. Since all Federal property is nontaxable it is only fair that Congress should say, as it did say in the Buck Act, that it does not claim tax exemptions for Federal employees residing on the reservations by reason of the fact that some of the Government services involved are furnished by the Federal Government in such cases. Moreover, residents on the Federal reservations do receive benefits from the Territorial and county governments. They come to town regularly and enjoy all the benefits of being in close proximity to an organized community.

The further objection has been made that nonresidents have to pay taxes in their home States as well. If true, the fault lies with the home States. We hold no brief for duplicate taxation. Though legally possible,⁸ as a matter of policy it should be avoided. However, the proper method of avoiding duplicate taxation is for the home States to exempt its residents with respect to income taxed elsewhere, or credit them for taxes paid elsewhere.

According to a study made by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, the 32 States (including Hawaii) which impose an income tax, may be divided into three groups, as follows: (a) 20 States provide for the elimination of duplicate taxation by allowing their residents a credit or deduction on account of tax liability to the State in which the income is earned. This may be a credit against the domiciliary State's tax, a provision for deduction from that State's tax base of income taxed elsewhere, a provision that business carried on outside the State is not taxable, or, as in the case of Hawaii, a provision that compensation earned elsewhere is not taxable if subjected to tax by any other jurisdiction, irrespective of the amount of the tax. One additional State allows a partial credit. (b) Six States provide for the taxation of the earnings of nonresidents within the State and also the earnings of residents wherever made, without allowing any credit for taxes of other jurisdictions; these six States do not make any provision to eliminate duplicate taxation. (c) Only five States follow the theory that the State of domicile has the prior right of taxation. These States either base their tax solely on the income of residents, nonresidents not being taxed at all, or else they allow a credit to nonresidents for taxes paid to the State of domicile on a reciprocal basis.

The great majority of the States have adopted the view that the State where compensation is earned has the prior right of taxation, and, to avoid duplicate taxation, these States exempt residents with respect to income taxed elsewhere, or credit them for taxes paid elsewhere.

This method of eliminating duplicate taxation not only represents the majority view of the several States but also is the sound view. The State or Territory in which compensation is earned should be recognized to have the prior right of taxation inasmuch as (1) taxes are more readily collectible in the place in which the taxpayer actually is to be found, and in many instances the domiciliary jurisdiction will not be able to collect taxes from its citizens after their absence from the State for many years; and (2), as above set forth, the presence of workers within a State or Territory increases the cost of government therein whether or not they become citizens of such jurisdiction, and it is not fair to require the citizens of such jurisdiction to bear the cost of government for the noncitizens. But in any event, Hawaii cannot be criticized for following the majority view.

Respectfully submitted.

C. NILS TAVARES,
Attorney General of Hawaii.

STATEMENT No. 32

MAUI AGRICULTURAL CO., LTD.,
Paia, Maui, T. H., January 16, 1946.

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.,

Chairman, Committee To Study Statehood for Hawaii.

DEAR SIR: I was unable to attend the hearing your committee held at Wailuku, Maui, and, at the suggestion of Delegate Joseph R. Farrington, I am taking the liberty of writing you a brief statement as to my position in connection with the question of statehood for Hawaii.

By the way of introduction, I am the manager of the Maui Agricultural Co., Ltd., sugar plantation. I was a member of the Territorial senate for five terms, and of the house for one term. In 1922 I was elected to fill the unexpired term of the late Honorable J. K. Kalanianaʻoli, as Delegate to Congress.

As each Delegate to Congress has strongly advocated, in turn I am fully in favor of Hawaii being granted statehood. A Delegate realizes his handicap in representing the Territory because of his not being allowed to vote on measures before Congress, and also the inadequacy of Hawaii's representation in Congress

⁸ The Supreme Court of the United States has held that earnings may be taxed where the services are rendered and also by the domiciliary state.

as compared to that of the States of the Union—that is, two Senators and at least one Representative, each with the right to vote on all matters under consideration.

Furthermore, we have been discriminated against to some extent in the past and are without legal recourse should Congress enact legislation inimical to our best interest in the future. This has been brought out fully at your hearings and I need not repeat. However, an incident I feel should have been mentioned but was not as far as I know, is that at the time of the famous Masse case there were many both in the Congress and officials of the administration who advocated taking away what self-government we now have and substituting a commission form of government. No one knows how near we came having this change thrust upon us in spite of the fact that the accusations of the Masses were never substantiated. As a matter of fact certain Pinkerton detectives who were employed to check up on these accusations reported that their findings indicated that the accusations were unfounded.

I believe that Hawaii is fully entitled to statehood on all counts. Our government in my opinion has been unusually free from faults that have frequently come to light in respect to several of the States, many of which faults would not be tolerated here.

With respect to our being authorized to elect our own governor should we attain statehood, I wish to say that I consider we have been exceedingly fortunate in the appointees in the past and do not think we could have elected better men, but this is not to say we cannot elect as good men to that position should we become a State.

In general, I agree with most of the testimony your committee has heard in favor of statehood, insofar as I have seen it in the local papers, and I disagree with most of the statements in opposition to Hawaii's obtaining this goal. At the time that Hawaii applied for annexation it was to be admitted as a State but we were obliged to accept the status as a Territory with statehood in the offing.

Respectfully yours,

HARRY A. BALDWIN.

STATEMENT No. 33

OF COURSE HAWAII WANTS STATEHOOD

(Statement by Charles R. Hemenway, Hawaiian Trust Co., Honolulu, T. H.)

Hawaii was annexed to the United States in 1898 at its own request. It was not acquired by conquest or by purchase. By its voluntary act its citizens become citizens of the United States and they are proud of that status. Since 1900 it has been an organized Territory, bearing its full share of the obligations which citizenship entails but not sharing automatically in all the benefits shared by the States—gaining these in part only after vigorous efforts by its Delegate. During these past 48 years Hawaii has looked forward to the day when it would graduate from its status as a Territory to that of a full member of the United States, with its star added to the 48 others on the Star-Spangled Banner.

During this World War Hawaii has demonstrated its loyalty as fully as has any section of our country. It has oversubscribed its quota in every war-bond drive. Its basic industries maintained production of food supplies in spite of labor and mechanical shortage, and supplied much-needed help to the armed forces. Its merchants' supplies were requisitioned and many of its schools and parks taken for military use. Its men and women gave their time and strength to the Red Cross, the USO, the OCD, and many other civilian war activities. Hawaii became an armed fortress. Thousands of Hawaii's sons, of many different racial ancestries, put on the uniform of their country. Hundreds now lie under white crosses in Italy, in France, in the South Pacific islands, in New Guinea, in Burma, in China, and in the Philippines. Hawaii was their home—the United States their country—and they gave their lives for their country.

Yet the question is raised again as to Hawaii's status—this time by Nicholas Murray Butler, widely known and influential scholar and educator, who proposes that Hawaii be made into a "democratic state but subject to the United States" and that it never be admitted to the Union. The proposal is fantastic.

How can our American citizenship be taken away and why should it be? Our record and that of our sons does not justify such treatment. On the contrary, we have been commended by both Army and Navy officials for our conduct and part in the war. This proposal is another illustration that our status both politically and economically will never be safe until we become a full member of the United States.

Of course, Hawaii wants statehood, and feels that it has earned it.

C. R. HEMENWAY,

Chairman of the Board, Hawaiian Trust Co., T. H.

STATEMENT No. 34

ROBERTSON, CASTLE & ANTHONY,

Honolulu, T. H., January 17, 1946.

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, Jr.,

Chairman, and Members of the Subcommittee on Territories of the House of Representatives of the United States.

GENTLEMEN: I am for statehood for Hawaii now.

Identification:—United States citizen; born Philadelphia, December 19, 1899; A. B., Swarthmore, 1923; LL. B., Harvard Law School, 192; married, Dorothy (McClaren) Anthony; children, Patricia and Garner; member, bar., Supreme Court; veteran, World War I; president, Bar Association, Hawaii, 1937-39; attorney general, Hawaii, 1942-43; president, Queen's Hospital; member land laws revision committee, president Hawaii Historical Society, Hawaii state delegate, American Bar Association; resident, Hawaii since 1926; address, 3251 Pacific Heights Road, Honolulu, T. H.

Reasons for statehood for Hawaii:—Hawaii is ready for statehood from all customary standards: population, wealth, and capacity for self-government. These facts will be conceded. The following propositions are submitted to the judgment of a candid Congress:

(1) Representation in the Congress will bring to the National Government a fresh and informed point of view concerning affairs of the Pacific. The dictum of Horace Greeley still has vitality. The future foreign affairs of the United States will center largely about the handling of the problems of the Pacific. In this field Senators and Representatives from Hawaii will bring to the councils of the National Government a degree of familiarity and understanding which will prove of value.

(2) One of the chief domestic problems that confronts the Nation and the several States in the immediate future is the treatment of, and adjustments among, minority groups. This difficult and troublesome subject presses for solution. Hawaii may not be entirely free from race and religious prejudices but there exists in this community an attitude of mind and heart which has resulted in the races of men living together with a large degree of harmony and mutual respect, a situation which is perhaps not duplicated in any other State of the Union.

(3) Although a considerable degree of self-government is afforded us under the Hawaiian Organic Act, our government and our people are not secure and never will be secure in their political and civil liberties until such time as we are admitted into the sisterhood of States. The recent experience of Hawaii under military rule is an example. No State of the Union could have been subjected to the excesses of military rule for 3 years as was Hawaii. The remedy afforded by voting representation in the Congress would have been swift and sure.

(4) The Republic of Hawaii was incorporated into the United States upon the implied understanding of ultimate statehood. To withhold the full rights of American citizenship from the people of Hawaii after a complete demonstration of their capacity would be a breach of the implied agreement and a breach of faith on the part of the Nation. It would not enhance the prestige of the United States in world affairs.

(5) Finally, the admission of Hawaii as a State follows the traditional pattern of our Government from its very inception. Incorporated Territories beginning with the Northwest Territory have all been admitted into the Union. At present there are but two incorporated Territories—Hawaii and Alaska. There is no room in our scheme of government for holding incorporated Territories in

a continued status of colonial provinces. Our form of Government and basic American ideals of fair play do not embrace the policy of the Roman Empire and its government of prostrate provinces. The historical pattern of evolution from a Territorial status to statehood is clear and is in harmony with the fundamental rights of mankind embodied in our organic documents, the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. By every standard that may be applied Hawaii is entitled to admission as a State of the Union in 1946.

Respectfully,

J. GARNER ANTHONY.

STATEMENT No. 35

HONOLULU 17, T. H., January 19, 1946.

Re Reapportionment of the Territorial Legislature.

HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON,

Delegate in Congress from Hawaii.

Old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR JOE: Enclosed is a statement I have prepared relating to the inability of the legislature to reapportion the membership in the senate and house of representatives among the senatorial and representative districts on the basis of the population in each of said districts who are citizens of the Territory.

My point is that the census enumerations of 1910, 1920, 1930, and 1940 have not provided the legislature with the population in the senatorial and representative districts who are citizens of the Territory.

Cordially yours,

LAWRENCE M. JUDD.

It is quite evident from the press reports of the hearings on statehood for Hawaii that much criticism has been directed toward the Governors of Hawaii, the Delegates, and the Territorial legislatures because the representation in the senate and house of representatives of Territorial legislature has not been reapportioned.

Section 4 of the Hawaiian Organic Act provides:

"That all persons who were citizens of the Republic of Hawaii on August twelfth, eighteen hundred and ninety-eight, are hereby declared to be citizens of the United States and citizens of the Territory of Hawaii.

"And all citizens of the United States resident in the Hawaiian Islands who were resident there on or since August twelfth, eighteen hundred and ninety-eight, and all the citizens of the United States who shall hereafter *reside in the Territory of Hawaii for one year* shall be citizens of the Territory of Hawaii." [Italics added.]

The requirement by the Congress relating to reapportionment of the legislature is contained in section 53 of the Hawaiian Organic Act. The applicable portion of that section reads:

"The legislature, at its first regular session after the census enumeration shall be ascertained, and from time to time thereafter, shall *reapportion* the membership in the senate and house of representatives among the senatorial and representative districts on the basis of the population in each of said districts who are *citizens of the Territory*." [Italics added.]

It is obvious that the legislature has been required to reapportion its membership on the basis of the population in each district who are "citizens of the Territory" as determined by "the census enumeration."

The census enumeration is a function of the United States Government.

The legislature cannot reapportion its membership except upon the enumeration of the Bureau of the Census.

Furthermore, the legislature cannot base reapportionment upon the population within the several districts, nor upon the number of registered voters, nor upon any basis other than on the population who are citizens of the Territory.

As previously stated, a citizen of the United States does not become a citizen of the Territory until such citizen resides in the Territory of Hawaii for 1 year.

In all fairness to the Bureau of the Census it should be stated that the requirement of obtaining the enumeration of "citizens of the Territory of Hawaii" is one that would not be contemplated by the usual census enumeration here or elsewhere.

A study of the census enumerations made prior to 1930 disclosed that such enumerations did not enumerate the citizens of the Territory, and that it would

not have been legally possible for the Territorial legislature to comply with the reapportionment requirement of section 55 of the Hawaiian Organic Act.

On July 7, 1930, the Governor of Hawaii dispatched the following radiogram to the Secretary of the Interior:

"In order to provide basis for reapportionment of membership in the Territorial legislature as required by section 55, Hawaiian Organic Act, please request Census Bureau to furnish me with population in each representative district of Territory of Hawaii who are citizens of the Territory."

The next day a supplementary radiogram was sent to the Secretary of the Interior referring to the radiogram of July 7, 1930, and adding:

"Will appreciate the citizen population figures both by precincts and representative districts."

At that time, the Delegate to Congress was informed, also by radiograms, of the foregoing requests and was asked to follow this up.

Despite these requests the Bureau of the Census did not determine the population in each of the districts who were citizens of the Territory.

As a consequence, the legislature since 1930 has also not been able legally to comply with the congressional requirement for reapportionment.

According to reliable information, the census enumeration taken in 1940 does not give the citizen population of the Territory. It is not believed that any special effort was made from this end to have that information compiled.

It does not therefore seem fair to place the blame for the failure to reapportion the membership of the legislature upon the legislature itself.

If the United States Government through the Bureau of the Census, has not made available to the Territorial legislature the census enumeration basis for reapportionment, it would appear that the major responsibility for the failure to reapportion the legislature must be assumed by the United States Government.

It is very important that either the Hawaiian Organic Act should be so amended as to provide another equitable basis for reapportionment upon census enumeration figures presently available or that the Bureau of the Census should provide the necessary census enumeration basis when the next census is taken.

EXHIBITS

LIST OF EXHIBITS FILED

HEARING, JANUARY 7, 1946

Presented by Hawaii Equal Rights Commission:

	Page
1a. Areas of the islands.....	653
2a. Hawaiian and part-Hawaiian population, 1778 to 1945.....	(1)
2b. Caucasian population, 1878 to 1945.....	(1)
2c. Chinese population, 1878 to 1945.....	(1)
2d. Japanese population, 1884 to 1945.....	(1)
2e. Filipino population, 1910 to 1945.....	(1)
2f. Population of Hawaii, 1778 to 1945.....	653
2g. Distribution of population by counties.....	653
2h. Population by race and citizenship.....	654
2i. Population of Hawaii by race, 1896 to 1945.....	655
3a. General statistics relative to the Territories of the United States at the date of their admission to the Union, and comparison with Hawaii.....	656
4a. Comparative table of internal-revenue collections, Hawaii and 14 States.....	658
4b. Internal-revenue collections by States and Territories, 1944.....	(2)
4c. Internal-revenue collections, Hawaii and United States, by type of revenue.....	658
4d. Comparative table of individual income-tax returns, 1940, by percentage of population filing individual returns.....	659
4e. Collections, United States internal revenue, district of Hawaii, 1900 to 1945.....	659
4f. Expenditures made by the Federal Government as direct payments to States and Territories under cooperative arrangements and expenditures within the States and Territories which provided relief and other aid, total payments and payments to Territory of Hawaii, fiscal year 1944.....	660
4g. Expenditures made by the Federal Government as direct payments to the States and Territories under cooperative arrangements and expenditures within States and Territories which provided relief and other aid, by States and Territories, 1944.....	661
4h. Federal grants and expenditures to States and Territory of Hawaii, on per capita basis, by rank of States, 1940.....	662
4i. United States customs receipts in the Territory of Hawaii, 1901 to 1944.....	663
4j. Post-office receipts at Honolulu.....	664
5a. Consolidated budget statement showing resources, obligations, reserves, and surplus at the close of the biennium ended June 30, 1945 (same as exhibit 45c) and consolidated statement of operations, year ended June 30, 1945 (see exhibit 45e).....	(3)
5b. Consolidated statement of operations, Territory of Hawaii and political subdivisions, fiscal year ended June 30, 1945 (same as exhibit 45d).....	(3)
5c. Cost of governmental services by functions, Territory of Hawaii and its political subdivisions for fiscal year ended June 30, 1940, and June 30, 1945 (same as exhibit 45f).....	(3)

¹ Not printed. Covered by exhibit 2i.

² Not printed. See pp. 287-289.

³ Not printed. Covered by exhibit 45.

List of exhibits filed—Continued

Presented by Hawaii Equal Rights Commission—Continued		Page
5d. Bonded debt of the Territory and its political subdivisions as of December 31, 1945.....		664
5e. Chart of Territorial tax system as of July 1, 1945.....		665
5f. Assessed value of real and personal property, 1945.....		668
6a. Number of business establishments by calendar years, Territory of Hawaii, 1935 to 1945.....		668
6b. Number of persons (including corporations) engaged in various types of business as of December 1945.....		668
6c. Dollar volume of business in various classifications as shown by gross income-tax records, 1936 to 1944 (comparative statement of gross income and consumption taxes collected and the tax base for the calendar years 1936 to 1944).....		676
6d. Retail sales per capita, continental United States and Territory of Hawaii, 1938 to 1944.....	(¹)	
6e. Agencies representing plantations by number of plantations represented and percent of total sugar production.....		678
6f. Bank deposits, 1901 to 1945.....		678
6g. Consolidated statement of condition of banks and trust companies.....		679
6h. Consolidated statement of condition of building and loan associations.....		679
6i. Consolidated statement of condition of licensees under the Industrial Loan Act, Territory of Hawaii.....		680
6j. Statement of public utilities.....		680
7a. Hawaiian sugar production in tons, 1837 to 1944.....		683
7b. Hawaiian sugar production by acreage and value from 1915 to 1944.....		683
7c. United States sugar consumption and principal sources of sugar consumed from 1898 to 1944.....		684
8a. Pineapple pack, Territory of Hawaii, 1922 to 1945.....		685
8b. Shipments, canned pineapple, Hawaii to mainland United States.....		686
9a. Statistical report on diversified agriculture.....		686
Table I. Total acreage by counties.....		686
Table II. Utilization of land area.....		686
Table III. Land used for crops.....		687
Table IV. All land in farms 1940 by size of farm.....		687
Table V. Number and type of diversified crop and livestock farms, 1944.....		687
Table VI. Irrigated acreage by counties, 1940.....		687
Table VII. Estimated production, marketings, and value of animal products.....		688
Table VIII. Food production and value.....		688
Table IX. Estimated acreage, production, and value of food crops, 1941, 1943, 1944, and preliminary estimates for 1945.....		689
Table X. Production trends of rice, coffee, and macadamia nuts.....		690
Table XI. Continental United States and Hawaiian trade in agricultural products, with summary of value of all products for 1940.....		690
Table XII. Origin of fresh fruit and vegetable receipts at Honolulu, 1941 and 1944.....		694
9b. Coffee production in Hawaii 1922 to 1944.....	(¹)	
10a. Trans-Pacific ship departures from Hawaii, 1922 to 1941.....		694
10b. Merchandise shipments and exports from Hawaii, 1901 to 1941.....		695
10c. Merchandise shipments and imports to Hawaii, 1901 to 1940.....		695
10d. Rank of customers of continental United States in order of amount purchased, 1933 to 1940.....		696
11a. Hawaii labor laws.....		696
11b. Hawaii child labor law.....		701

¹ Not printed. Available in files of Committee on the Territories.

² Not printed. Covered by exhibit 9a.

List of exhibits filed—Continued

Presented by Hawaii Equal Rights Commission—Continued		Page
11c. Unemployment compensation coverage by number and type of reporting units.....		702
11d. Average monthly number of workers covered by Hawaii unemployment compensation law.....		703
11e. Average weekly wages, workers covered by Hawaii unemployment compensation law.....		704
11f. Comparative average weekly wages of industrial workers, Hawaii and mainland United States, 1940 to 1945.....		704
11g. Sugar industry: Stock ownership, labor.....		705
11h. Pineapple industry: Plantations and canneries, land, labor.....		705
11i. Wartime earnings and spending in Honolulu, 1943.....	(⁶)	
11j. Index of cost of goods and services, Honolulu, 1943 to 1944.....	(⁷)	
11k. Consumers price index, Honolulu, as of September 15, 1945.....	(⁷)	
11l. Maximum unemployment compensation benefits, by States, 1945.....		706
11m. Minimum unemployment compensation benefits, by States, 1945.....		708
11n. Unemployment compensation claims data, by States, 1945.....	(¹)	
11o. Hawaii labor organizations, December 1945.....		709
11p. Hawaii labor disputes and strikes, 1940 to 1945.....		712
11q. Major occupation group of employed persons, Hawaii, 1940.....	(⁸)	
12a. Public schools of Hawaii compared with continental United States.....		715
12b. Number of schools, teachers, and pupils in the Territory of Hawaii.....		716
12c. Public-school teachers and pupils by islands and districts.....		716
12d. Number of pupils in the public schools by islands according to the course of study.....		717
12e. Pupils by racial descent, public and private schools.....		717
12f. Classification of public-school pupils by citizenship.....		717
12g. Racial distribution of pupils in first grade over 11-year period, public and private schools.....		718
12h. University of Hawaii.....		718
12i. Public libraries of Hawaii.....		719
13a. Percentage of registrants voting, by racial groups, 1938.....		721
13b. Registered voters, by racial groups at each general election.....		721
13c. Number and percentage of registered voters, in five racial groups, 1932 to 1940.....		722
13d. Percentage of registrants voting, 1900 to 1944.....		722
13e. Votes received by candidates for Delegate to Congress at each general election.....		722
13f. Senators and representatives, by parties, in each legislature.....		723
13g. Citizen population of voting age and votes cast in the States and in the Territory of Hawaii 1942 by number and by percentage.....		723
13h. Number and percent of registrants and votes cast, Honolulu and comparable United States cities.....		724
13i. Official results of plebiscite vote, 1940.....		725
14a. Summary of expenditures and personnel, Territorial board of health.....		725
14b. Comparison of Hawaii's death rates from 22 causes with death rates reported from 43 States, Territories, and District of Columbia, 1943.....	(⁹)	
14c. Comparison of general mortality rates, Hawaii and United States.....	(⁹)	
14d. Comparison of infant mortality rate, Hawaii and United States.....	(⁹)	
14e. Comparison of maternal mortality rate, Hawaii and United States.....	(⁹)	
14f. Comparison of tuberculosis mortality rate, Hawaii and United States.....	(⁹)	

⁶ Not printed. Available in files of Committee on the Territories.

⁷ Not printed. Available at U. S. Government Printing Office: Department of Labor Bulletin No. 788.

⁸ Not printed. Available from department of labor and industrial relations, Territory of Hawaii.

⁹ Not printed. See exhibit 33.

⁹ Not printed. Covered by exhibit 58.

List of exhibits filed—Continued

Presented by Hawaii Equal Rights Commission—Continued		Page
14g. Comparison of typhoid mortality rate, Hawaii and United States-----	(12)	
14h. Venereal disease rates, comparison of Hawaii and United States-----	(12)	
14i. Public-assistance payments in the States and in the Territory of Hawaii by number of recipients and by size of average monthly grant, August 1945-----		725
14j. Public-assistance payments in the States and in the Territory of Hawaii by total amount and amount per inhabitant, 1944-----		726
15a. Total bond sales during World War II-----		727
15b. Hawaii's per capita average war-bond purchases during World War II-----		728
16. Report of the Joint Committee on Hawaii, 1937-----	(10)	
17. Message of Ingram M. Stainback, Governor of Hawaii, to the twenty-third session of the Territorial Legislature, February 22, 1945-----		728
Presented by Roy A. Vitousek, chairman, Territorial Central Committee of the Republican Party:		
18. Resolution of the Territorial Central Committee of the Republican Party of Hawaii, signed by Roy A. Vitousek, chairman-----		736
Presented by Hawaii Equal Rights Commission:		
19. History of Organized Defense Volunteers in the Territory of Hawaii, prepared by the public relations office, Central Pacific Base Command-----	(11)	
20. Letter from Alice H. Cooke, director, USO, Territory of Hawaii-----		736
21. Letter from Arthur H. Eyles III, manager, Honolulu Community Chest-----		736
22. Letter from J. Howard Ellis, executive director, American Red Cross, Hawaii chapter-----		738

HEARING, JANUARY 8, 1946

Presented by Nils P. Larsen, M. D., for the Honolulu County Medical Society:		
23. Hawaii Medical Journal, volume 4, No. 6, July to August, 1945-----	(12)	
24. A. Plantation Health, volume IX, No. 1, January 1945-----	(12)	
B. Plantation Health, volume IX, No. 2, April 1945-----	(12)	
C. Plantation Health, volume IX, No. 4, October 1945-----	(12)	
D. Plantation Health, volume VIII, No. 2, April 1944-----	(12)	
E. Plantation Health, volume VII, No. 3, July 1943-----	(12)	
F. Plantation Health, volume VII, No. 4, October 1943-----	(12)	
25. First annual meeting of the Territorial Association of Plantation Physicians of Hawaii, 1944-----	(12)	
26. List of the Territorial doctors who served with the armed forces during World War II-----		738
Presented by Dr. E. C. Auchter, for the Pineapple Growers' Association:		
27. A. A resolution from the Pineapple Growers' Association of Hawaii unanimously favoring statehood for Hawaii-----	(12)	
B. A resolution of the Pineapple Research Institute of Hawaii favoring immediate admission of Hawaii as a State-----	(12)	
Presented by Chauncey B. Wightman, for the Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association:		
28. A. "Report of the President, 1945" Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association-----	(12)	
B. Resolution from the trustees of the Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association for statehood for Hawaii-----	(12)	
29. The War Record of Civilian and Industrial Hawaii, a documentary history of the assistance extended to the armed forces by the civilian community and the sugar plantations-----	(12)	

¹⁰ Not printed. Available as S. Doc. 151, 75th Cong., 3d sess., from U. S. Government Printing Office.

¹¹ Not printed. See exhibit 65b.

¹² Not printed. Available in files of Committee on the Territories.

List of exhibits filed—Continued

HEARING, JANUARY 8, 1946—Continued

Presented by Chauncey B. Wightman—Continued	Page-
30. A. Chart comparing sugarcane acreage, sugar production, average number of male adult employees (unskilled) and on Hawaiian sugar plantations, 1936 to 1945.....	(14)
B. Chart comparing pay rolls and total man-days of all unskilled employees on Hawaiian sugar plantations for period 1936 to 1945, inclusive.....	(14)
Presented by Hawaii Equal Rights Commission:	
31. Memo to Hawaii Equal Rights Commission from Maj. Lake E. Bellinger, deputy director, Territorial Selective Service, relating to selective service rejections for illiteracy.....	739
32. Letter from Maude Jones, archivist, Territory of Hawaii, relating to foreign-language newspapers.....	740
Presented by Newton R. Holcomb, for United States Employment Service:	
33. Estimated employment, Territory of Hawaii, by islands.....	741
Presented by Louis Q. McComas, for department of labor and industrial relations:	
33a. Chart of the department of labor and industrial relations, Territory of Hawaii.....	(14)
Presented by Jack W. Hall, for the CIO.:	
34. Copy of a letter to Governor Stainback from Jack W. Hall regarding the effect of the end of hostilities and the recruitment of labor from abroad.....	741

HEARING, JANUARY 9, 1946

Presented by Robert H. Lloyd, for Hawaii Housing Authority:	
35. Kamehameha Homes. Racial extraction of families living in project.....	744
Presented by A. Lester Marks, commissioner of public lands:	
36. A. Areas in acres of all lands in the Territory of Hawaii by approximate ownership and utilization.....	745
B. Sheet No. 1, utilization of public lands, Territory of Hawaii.....	(14)
C. Sheet No. 2, utilization of public lands, by islands.....	(14)
D. Supplementary chart with data for sheets No. 1 and No. 2....	746
Presented by C. Nils Tavares, attorney general:	
37. Copy of the land laws revision commission report of February 1945.....	748
Presented by Dr. Gilbert G. Lentz, director, Legislative Reference Bureau:	
38. Organization chart of the government of the Territory of Hawaii.....	(14)
39. A digest of the Organization and Functions of Departments, Boards and Commissions, first revision, August 1945.....	(13)
40. Organization chart, city and county of Honolulu, January 1946....	(14)
41. A digest of the Organization and Functions of Departments, Boards and Commissions, City and County of Honolulu, August 1945.....	(13)
42. Division of Honolulu city and county and Territorial governmental functions, July 1944.....	752
Presented by Campbell C. Crozier, assistant tax commissioner:	
43. Real property inventory schedules showing private ownerships, city and county of Honolulu, January 1, 1945, and outside islands.....	759
44. Land ownership (by acreage) expressed in percentage.....	762
Presented by Joseph Dickson, auditor, Territory of Hawaii:	
45. A. Report of the auditor to the Governor of the Territory of Hawaii for the biennium ended June 30, 1945.....	(14)
B. Consolidated balance sheet as of the close of the biennium ended June 30, 1945.....	763

¹³ Not printed. Available from Legislative Reference Bureau, Territory of Hawaii.¹⁴ Not printed. Available in files of Committee on the Territories.

List of exhibits filed—Continued

HEARING, JANUARY 9, 1946—Continued

Presented by Joseph Dickson—Continued

	Page
C. Consolidated budget statement as of the close of the biennium ended June 30, 1945.....	764
D. Consolidated statement of operations, Territory of Hawaii and its political subdivisions; receipts and payments for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945.....	766
E. Consolidated statement of operations, Territory of Hawaii, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945.....	(15)
F. Comparative statement of cost of government services, Territory of Hawaii and its political subdivisions for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1940, and June 30, 1945.....	(15)

HEARING, JANUARY 10, 1946

Presented by Chuck Mau, supervisor for the city and county of Honolulu:

46. A. Analysis of finances, city and county of Honolulu.....	(15)
B. Controller's report, city and county of Honolulu, fiscal year ended December 31, 1944.....	(15)

Presented by Representative Hal Hanna:

47. Land Monopoly in Hawaii, compiled by Representative Hal Hanna.....	770
48. Big 5 Monopoly in Hawaii, compiled by Representative Hal Hanna.....	783

Presented by John F. G. Stokes:

49. A. Hawaii Times, Saturday, November 4, 1944.....	821
B. Hawaii Times, Monday, November 6, 1944.....	822

HEARING, JANUARY 14, 1946

Presented by Representative J. G. Andrews:

50. A. Letter to Will N. King from J. G. Andrews relating to payments to sugarcane producers.....	822
B. Letter to J. G. Andrews from Will N. King relating to same.....	823
51. Suggested revision of organic act, section 4542, Revised Laws of Hawaii 1945, by Joseph G. Andrews.....	824

HEARING, JANUARY 15, 1946

Presented by Hawaii Equal Rights Commission:

52. Resolution favoring statehood for Hawaii by Hawaiian Civic Club signed by Charles Akana, vice president.....	(15)
53. Resolution advocating statehood for Hawaii adopted by Hawaiian Government Employees' Association, signed by Daniel K. Ainoa, president.....	(15)
54. Resolution favoring statehood for Hawaii by Filipino Federation of America, Inc., signed by Bernardino D. Arado, executive chairman.....	(15)
55. Compilation of rail-line operating statistics, compiled from reports on file with the Public Utilities Commission, Territory of Hawaii.....	825
56. Comparative statement of net paid newspaper circulation of leading newspapers, submitted by legislative reference bureau.....	826
57. Schedule of real property tax rates for counties by William Borthwick.....	827
58. Information regarding health conditions in the Territory of Hawaii, prepared by the Territorial health department:	
A. Crude mortality rates.....	828
B. Infant mortality rates.....	828
C. Maternal mortality rates.....	829
D. Death rates for tuberculosis.....	829
E. Population estimates.....	830

¹⁵ Not printed. Available in files of Committee on the Territories.

List of exhibits filed—Continued

HEARING, JANUARY 15, 1946—Continued

Presented by Hawaii Equal Rights Commission—Continued		Page
59. Apparent civilian consumption of milk and cream by agricultural extension service, University of Hawaii.....		830
60. Correspondence of Charles F. Loomis, head of Morale Section, with Army G-2 and police department concerning rumors of sabotage by Japanese.....		831
A. Letter from Galen M. Fisher.....		831
B. Letter from Kendall J. Fielder.....		831
C. Letter from W. A. Gabrielson.....		832
Presented Mr. Heaton L. Wrenn, for the Bar Association of Hawaii:		
61. Resolution of the Bar Association of Hawaii, signed by J. Donovan Flint.....	(16)	
Presented by Oren E. Long, for the Department of Public Instruction:		
62. A. School Code of Hawaii, Jan. 1, 1945.....	(17)	
B. War record: An open letter, and school participation in the war.....		832
C. Hawaii course of study, 1944.....	(17)	
D. Biennial report, 1943-44.....	(17)	
Presented by John H. Wilson, for the Department of Public Welfare:		
63. A. Minimum qualifications and salaries for the beginning visitor position in State public assistance agencies, May 1944.....	(18)	
B. Summary of medical-care program, number of individuals authorized for treatment and actual disbursements for fiscal years 1943-44 and 1944-45.....		834
C. Public assistance program in Territory of Hawaii, by Oscar M. Powell, executive director, Social Security Board.....		834
Presented by C. Nils Tavares, for the Office of the Attorney General:		
64. Exhibits by C. Nils Tavares, as part of statement on law enforcement in the Territory of Hawaii:		
A. Tables of criminal matters disposed of by courts, and of average crime rates.....		835
B. Explanation of crime statistics; comparative tables showing the number of offenses of each type for each county for each year from 1939 to 1945.....	(19)	
C. Comparative chart showing increase or decrease in the rate of part I offenses of the city and county of Honolulu.....	(19)	
D. Comparative chart showing increase or decrease in the rate of part I offenses of the county of Hawaii.....	(19)	
E. Comparative chart showing increase or decrease in the rate of part I offenses of the county of Maui.....	(19)	
F. Comparative chart showing increase or decrease in the rate of part I offenses of the county of Kauai.....	(19)	
G. Comparative chart showing increase or decrease in the rate of part I offenses of the entire Territory of Hawaii.....	(19)	
H. Comparison of totals of offenses against civilian population, etc., of the city and county of Honolulu.....	(19)	
I. Comparison of totals of offenses against civilian population, etc., showing graphically the county of Hawaii.....	(19)	
J. Comparison of totals of offenses against civilian population, etc., showing graphically the county of Maui.....	(19)	
K. Comparison of totals of offenses against civilian population, etc., showing graphically the county of Kauai.....	(19)	
L. Comparison of totals of offenses against civilian population, etc., showing graphically the Territory of Hawaii.....	(18)	

¹⁶ Not printed. Available in files of Committee on the Territories.¹⁷ Not printed. Available from Department of Public Instruction, Territory of Hawaii.¹⁸ Not printed. Available from Department of Public Welfare, Territory of Hawaii.¹⁹ Not printed. Available from Bureau of Crime Statistics and Identification, Territory of Hawaii.

List of exhibits filed—Continued

HEARING, JANUARY 15, 1946—Continued

Presented by Hawaii Equal Rights Commission:	Page
65. Army commendations of the war record of the people of Hawaii, by Hawaii War Records Depository-----	837
A. Richardson thanks the Territory of Hawaii for aid during war (article published in the Honolulu Advertiser, September 3, 1945)-----	837
B. Text of address by Lt. Gen. Robert C. Richardson, Jr., to regiments of the Organized Defense Volunteers of the Territory of Hawaii on July 4, 1945-----	838
C. Lt. Gen. Delos C. Emmons pays high tribute to Hawaii citizens on occasion of turning over command to Lt. Gen. Richardson (article published in Honolulu Advertiser and Honolulu Star-Bulletin, May 28, 1943)---	839
D. Commendation from Col. George F. Unmacht, Chemical Warfare Service, department chemical officer-----	840
66. Resolution of the Hawaii Chinese Civic Association, signed by Quan Lun Ching, president-----	(20)
Presented by Roy A. Vitousek, chairman, Territorial Central Committee, Republican Party:	
67. A. Photostatic copy of pages 48 and 49 of House Report No. 2124 being fourth interim report of Select Committee Investigating Defense Migration, showing letters from Henry L. Stimson, Frank Knox, and James Rowe, Jr.-----	841
B. Affidavit of W. A. Gabrielson, chief of police-----	842
C. Affidavit of Dewey O. Mookini, captain in the police department-----	851
D. Affidavit of John A. Burns, captain in the police department--	855
E. Affidavit of Edward J. Burns, assistant chief of police department-----	857
F. Affidavit of Hung Chin Ching, member of the Honolulu Police Department-----	858
G. Affidavit of Sing Chang, member of the Honolulu Police Department-----	858
H. Affidavit of Stafford L. Austin, manager, Honolulu Plantation Co.; chairman of all rural districts on the island of Oahu under the Office of Civilian Defense-----	859
I. Affidavit of Hans L'Orange, manager, Oahu Sugar Co., Ltd.--	861
J. Affidavit of Frederick C. Denison, Hawaiian Sugar Planters Association-----	863
K. Affidavit of J. D. Bond, manager, Ewa Plantation Co.-----	866
L. Affidavit of Robert Fricke, manager of Waianae Co.-----	868
M. Affidavit of John H. Midkiff, manager, Waialua Agricultural Co., Ltd.-----	869
N. Affidavit of James N. Orrick, manager, Plantation Co.-----	871
Presented by Hawaii Equal Rights Commission:	
68. Facts concerning the B. P. Bishop estate, the foundation of the Kamehameha Schools in Hawaii-----	873
69. Educational policy of the Kamehameha schools 1944 by the trustees of the Bernice P. Bishop estate-----	(21)
Presented by H. P. Faye, for the chamber of commerce:	
70. Resolution by the Chamber of Commerce of Honolulu, signed by H. P. Faye, president, and John A. Hamilton, executive vice president-----	(22)
Presented by Roy C. Kesner, for the retail board, chamber of commerce:	
71. Exhibit concerning retailers and small businesses in Hawaii as part of statement by Roy C. Kesner, president of Retail Board, Honolulu Chamber of Commerce-----	875

²⁰ Not printed. Available in files of Committee on the Territories.

²¹ Not printed. Available from the trustees.

²² Not printed. Available in files of Committee on the Territories.

List of exhibits filed—Continued

HEARING, JANUARY 15, 1946—Continued

Presented by Col. Adna G. Clarke, USA (retired):	Page
72. A. Activities of all American Legion posts.....	881
B. Special report on Midway Island Post.....	(23)
C. Composition mission and accomplishment of the explosive detail.....	(23)
D. Typical hospital guard detail.....	(23)
E. Diaries of 23 boys, Troop No. 36, Boy Scouts of America, sponsored by Honolulu American Legion Post No. 1.....	(23)
Presented by Richard Kageyama:	
73. A. Statehood for Hawaii is approved in mainland poll; and United States for Hawaii State, Gallup polls mainland, by Dr. George Gallup; Honolulu Star-Bulletin, January 23, 1941.....	887
B. Hearings on statehood: Their significance, Honolulu Star-Bulletin editorial, January 5, 1946.....	889
C. Senate accord on statehood finally gained, Honolulu Advertiser, March 6, 1945.....	891
D. Hawaii statehood favored, Honolulu Star-Bulletin.....	893
E. Newspaper articles on commendation of AJA's, Honolulu Star-Bulletin January 21, 1944; November 22, December 29, July 13, January 20.....	893
Presented by Oscar Smith:	
74. Resolution by All States Clubs of Pearl Harbor War Workers, by Oscar Smith.....	(24)

HEARING, JANUARY 17, 1946

Presented by Senator Alice Kamokila Campbell:	
75. Graphic chart showing racial composition of entire population in Territory, 1910 to 1934.....	(23)
Presented by Roy A. Vitousek, chairman, Territorial Central Committee, Republican Party of Hawaii:	
76. National and local party planks on statehood and self-government, 1938 to 1944, submitted by Roy A. Vitousek, chairman, Territorial Central Committee, Republican Party of Hawaii.....	896
Presented by board of supervisors, city and county of Honolulu:	
77. Resolution of board of supervisors, city and county of Honolulu, presented by Leon K. Sterling, city clerk.....	(23)
Presented by Junior Chamber of Commerce of Honolulu:	
78. A. Resolution endorsing immediate statehood for Hawaii by the Honolulu Junior Chamber of Commerce.....	(23)
B. Factual statement supporting the resolution of the Honolulu Junior Chamber of Commerce.....	898
Presented by Hawaii Equal Rights Commission:	
79. A. Comparison of the hourly wage in the pineapple industry with that of the food industry on the mainland.....	901
B. Average annual earnings of all regular hourly rate employees on the pay roll during the past year in the pineapple industry.....	902
80. A schedule showing land held by the Federal Government in 1934 and at the present time.....	902
81. Schedule showing tax collections, calendar year 1945.....	903
82. Resolution of Hana Like Club, favoring statehood.....	(23)
83. Resolution of board of directors of the Federation of American Chinese Clubs, favoring statehood.....	(23)

²² Not printed. Available in files of Committee on the Territories.

²³ Not printed. Read into the record.

List of exhibits filed—Continued

HEARING, JANUARY 17, 1946—Continued

Presented by Hawaii Equal Rights Commission—Continued		Page
84. Charts from the department of labor and industrial relations showing workmen's compensation coverage on comparative basis.....	(24)	
A. Occupational-disease compensation in States and Territories.....	(24)	
B. Workmen's compensation: Provisions for medical-hospital care in States and Territory of Hawaii.....	(24)	
C. Workmen's compensation: Insurance provisions in States and Territory of Hawaii.....	(24)	
D. Workmen's compensation: Numerical limitations on coverage in States and Territory of Hawaii.....	(24)	
E. Workmen's compensation: Compulsory and elective coverage in the States and Territory of Hawaii.....	(24)	
F. Second injury funds or equivalent arrangements in the States and Territories.....	(24)	
Presented by C. Nils Tavares, Attorney General:		
85. Letter from Ray Madison, captain, crime prevention division, Honolulu Police Department, relating to reports obtained by him with respect to the islands of Maui, Hawaii, and Kauai.....		903
86. Table from Norman C. Smith's survey of 1942 of Maui Youth Adrift, showing the 11-year average rate of delinquency for 1930 to 1940.....		904
87. Table prepared by Captain Madison showing individual juveniles charged during 1945 by the crime prevention division of the Honolulu Police Department.....		904
88. Table prepared by Captain Madison showing individual juveniles charged during 1945 and referred by the crime prevention division of the Honolulu Police Department to other departments, courts, or agencies.....		906
89. Annual report for the year 1944 by Captain Madison, relating to juvenile delinquency in Honolulu.....	(25)	

HEARING, JANUARY 18, 1946

Presented by Mrs. Alan Faye, Lihue, Kauai:	
90. A copy of a "Letter from the people," appearing in the newspaper, the Garden Island, Lihue, Kauai, March 20, 1944.....	(26)
91. A paper entitled "A young American with a Japanese face," written by Kazumi Miyamoto, March 1944.....	(26)
92. A paper entitled "Topics volunteered for oral talks by the senior English class of Waimea High and Elementary School, September to December, 1944".....	(26)

FOLLOWING CLOSE OF HEARINGS

Presented by Chauncey B. Wightman:	
93. Home ownership of sugar plantation workers.....	908
94. Annual earnings of sugar plantation workers.....	908

²⁴ Not printed. Available in files of Committee on the Territories.

²⁵ Not printed. Available from Crime Prevention Division, Honolulu Police Department.

²⁶ Not printed. Available in files of Committee on the Territories.

EXHIBIT 1A. PRESENTED BY HAWAII EQUAL RIGHTS COMMISSION

Areas of islands

Island	Square miles	Acres	Island	Square miles	Acres
Hawaii.....	4,030	2,579,000	Lanai.....	141	90,200
Maui.....	728	466,000	Niihau.....	72	46,000
Oahu ¹	604	387,000	Kahoolawe.....	45	29,090
Kauai.....	555	355,000			
Molokai.....	260	166,000	Total.....	6,435	4,118,200

¹ Honolulu, capital and metropolis of the Territory, covers an area of 82.2 square miles, or 52,608 acres.
Statistics from Thrum's Hawaiian Annual.

EXHIBIT 2F. PRESENTED BY HAWAII EQUAL RIGHTS COMMISSION

POPULATION OF HAWAII, 1778-1945

1778 (estimated).....	300,000	1910.....	191,909
1832.....	124,449	1920.....	255,912
1836.....	107,954	1930.....	368,336
1950.....	84,165	1937.....	396,715
1860.....	69,800	1938.....	411,485
1866.....	62,959	1939.....	414,991
1872.....	56,897	1940.....	423,330
1878.....	57,985	1941 ¹	465,339
1884.....	80,578	1942.....	474,351
1890.....	89,990	1943.....	483,363
1896.....	109,020	1944.....	492,379
1900.....	154,001	1945.....	502,122

¹ Civilians only 1941 and later.

EXHIBIT 2G. PRESENTED BY HAWAII EQUAL RIGHTS COMMISSION

Distribution of population by counties, 1930, 1937, and 1945

	1930	1937	Increase	1945 ¹	Increase or decrease
City of Honolulu.....	137,582	147,450	9,868	261,033	123,451
City and county of Honolulu (exclusive of Honolulu City).....	63,341	71,357	6,016	87,012	23,671
Total city and county of Honolulu.....	202,923	218,807	15,884	348,045	147,122
County of Hawaii.....	73,325	78,489	5,164	70,049	-3,276
County of Maui (including Molokai, Lanai, and Kahoolawe Islands, and Kalawao).....	56,146	61,124	4,978	51,378	-4,766
County of Kauai (including Niihau Island).....	35,942	38,295	2,353	32,650	-3,292
Total.....	368,336	396,715	28,379	502,122	135,756

¹ 1945 figures estimated by Office of Civilian Defense, Division of Registration and Identification.

EXHIBIT 2H. PRESENTED BY HAWAII EQUAL RIGHTS COMMISSION

Population by race and citizenship, 1934, 1937, and 1940

Racial classification	1934			1937			Increase in citizens	1940			Increase in citizens
	Total	Citizens	Aliens	Total	Citizens	Aliens		Total	Citizens	Aliens	
Hawaiian and part-Hawaiian	56,215	56,215	-----	60,546	60,546	-----	4,331	64,310	64,297	13	3,751
Caucasian	83,671	80,011	3,660	96,782	93,485	3,297	13,474	103,791	100,981	2,810	7,496
Chinese	26,989	21,640	5,349	27,657	23,246	4,411	1,606	28,774	24,129	4,645	883
Japanese	148,024	105,957	42,067	151,141	113,289	37,852	7,332	157,905	120,700	37,205	7,411
Filipino	56,700	13,139	43,561	53,035	15,322	37,713	2,183	52,569	17,071	35,498	1,749
All others	7,349	4,651	2,698	7,554	5,068	2,486	417	15,981	13,594	2,387	5,526
Total	378,948	281,613	97,335	396,715	310,956	85,759	29,343	423,330	340,772	82,558	29,816
								1934	1937	1940	
Percentage of citizens								74.3	78.4	80.5	
Percentage of aliens								25.7	21.6	19.5	

EXHIBIT 21. PRESENTED BY HAWAII EQUAL RIGHTS COMMISSION

Population of Hawaii by race, 1896-1945

[See also the last table of exhibit 58 for yearly population figures, by race, from 1925 to 1945]

Race	1896 ¹		1900 ²		1910 ³		1920 ³		1930 ³		1940 ³		1945 ⁴	
	Popula- tion	Percent	Popula- tion	Percent	Popula- tion	Percent	Popula- tion	Percent	Popula- tion	Percent	Popula- tion	Percent	Popula- tion	Percent
Hawaiian ⁵	31,019	28.5											10,988	2.2
Part-Hawaiian ⁵	8,485	7.8											61,422	12.2
Hawaiian and part-Hawaiian	39,504	36.3	38,254	24.8	38,547	20.1	41,750	16.3	50,860	13.7	64,310	15.2	72,410	14.4
Caucasian	22,438	20.6	26,252	17.1	39,158	20.4	49,140	19.3	73,702	20.0	103,791	24.5	172,583	34.4
Chinese	21,616	19.8	25,762	16.7	21,674	11.3	23,507	9.2	27,179	7.4	28,774	6.8	30,005	6.0
Japanese	24,407	22.4	61,115	39.7	79,675	41.5	109,274	42.7	139,631	37.9	157,905	37.3	163,300	32.5
Korean					4,533	2.4	4,950	1.9	6,461	1.8	6,851	1.6	7,042	1.4
Filipino					2,361	1.2	21,031	8.2	63,052	17.1	52,569	12.4	46,464	9.3
Puerto Rican					4,890	2.5	5,602	2.2	6,671	1.8	8,296	2.0	9,090	1.8
Negro					695	.4	348	.1	563	.2	255	.1	(⁶)	
Other	1,055	.9	2,618	1.7	376	.2	310	.1	217	.1	579	.1	1,228	.2
Total	109,020	100.0	154,001	100.0	191,909	100.0	255,912	100.0	368,336	100.0	423,330	100.0	502,122	100.0

¹ Corrected figures, from the work of Dr. Romanzo Adams. See the record of the 1937 hearings before the Joint Committee on Hawaii, 75th Cong., 2d sess., p. 440.

² Census figures, except that the number of Hawaiians and part-Hawaiians has been corrected in accordance with the 1937 report of the Joint Committee on Hawaii, S. Doc. No. 151, 75th Cong., 3d sess., p. 38.

³ Census figures.

⁴ Estimate of civilians only, Bureau of Vital Statistics, Territorial board of health, revised in accordance with estimates of Office of Civilian Defense, Division of Registration and Identification.

⁵ These figures not furnished for years 1900-30 because of inaccuracies in classification as between Hawaiian and part-Hawaiian.

⁶ Included in "Other" for 1945.

EXHIBIT 3A. PRESENTED BY HAWAII EQUAL RIGHTS COMMISSION

General statistics relative to the Territories of the United States at the date of their admission to the Union and comparison with Hawaii

Territory	Date of organic act	Date admitted as State	Population at date of organic act	Racial classification and total population at date of admission as State				Value at date of admission as State ¹		
				Negroes	Whites	Indians ¹ and Orientals ²	Total	Real property ⁴	Raw materials	Goods produced
Ohio	1787	1803		337	45,028		45,365			
Tennessee	1790	1796	35,691	13,893	91,709		105,602			
Mississippi	1798	1817	8,850	33,272	42,176		75,448			
Indiana	1800	1816	5,641	1,420	145,758		147,178			
Louisiana	1804	1812	76,556	42,245	34,311		76,556			
Michigan	1805	1837	4,762	707	211,560		212,267			
Missouri	1805	1821	20,845	10,569	56,017		66,586			
Illinois	1809	1818	12,282	1,374	53,837		55,211			
Alabama	1817	1819		42,450	85,451		127,901			
Arkansas	1819	1836	14,255	20,400	77,174		97,574			
Florida	1822	1845		40,242	47,203		87,445	\$7,924,588	\$220,611	\$668,235
Wisconsin	1826	1848	30,945	635	304,756		305,391	22,458,442	5,414,931	7,293,068
Iowa	1838	1846	43,112	333	191,881		192,214	15,672,332	2,356,681	3,551,783
Oregon	1848	1859	13,294	128	52,160		52,288	6,279,602	1,452,000	3,138,000
Minnesota	1849	1858	6,077	259	169,395		169,654	25,291,771	2,060,000	3,600,000
New Mexico	1850	1912	61,547	1,628	304,554	21,078	327,300	34,682,427	4,430,134	9,320,067
Utah	1850	1896	11,388	672	272,465	3,612	276,749	68,515,498	11,440,250	17,981,648
Washington	1853	1859	11,198	1,602	340,829	11,181	353,612	177,640,259	19,917,057	41,768,022
Nebraska	1854	1867	28,841	789	122,117		122,906	38,365,999	2,902,074	5,738,512
Kansas	1854	1861		627	106,390		107,017	16,088,602	669,269	2,800,000
Colorado	1861	1876	34,277	2,435	191,126		193,561	35,604,197	8,806,762	14,260,159
Nevada	1861	1864	6,857	45	6,812		6,857			
North Dakota	1861	1889		373	182,407	8,174	190,954			
South Dakota	1861	1889	2,977	541	328,010	19,854	348,405	166,559,896	6,611,001	10,710,855
Arizona	1863	1912	9,658	2,009	171,468	30,877	204,354	84,328,045	39,283,038	64,098,510
Idaho	1863	1890		201	82,117	4,223	86,541	9,977,463	638,673	1,396,096
Montana	1864	1889	20,595	1,488	117,000	11,206	129,794	54,943,531	2,375,093	5,507,573
Wyoming	1868	1890	9,118	922	59,783	1,844	62,549	12,719,221	1,084,432	2,367,601
Oklahoma	1890	1907	61,864	137,612	1,444,531	74,825	1,656,968	719,703,439	34,162,844	53,682,405
Hawaii ⁴	1900		154,001				502,122	500,493,838		112,441,163

¹ No census of Indian population by State available prior to 1890.² Orientals: New Mexico, 506; Utah, 989; Arizona, 1,676.

³ Figures for the population, assessed valuation of real property, and production, taken from the census nearest the date of admission as a State.

⁴ No figures available for the assessed value of real property or value of products prior to 1850.

⁵ Data on Hawaii: Population, board of health estimate for 1945; assessed value of real property for 1945—Territorial Tax Office. Hawaii's export of raw materials is insignificant. Goods produced include sugar (1945 figure), pineapple (1941 figure), coffee (1945 figure). For racial classification in Hawaii, see exhibit 2i.

Sources of data on other Territories: Carter's Territorial Papers, vol. 1; Census reports; Compendium of the Enumeration of the Inhabitants and Statistics of the United States, 1840; Organic acts in the Statutes at Large, U. S.; J. D. B. DeBow, Industrial Resources, etc., of the Southern & Western States; Samuel Hallett, Industrial and Financial Resources of the United States of America.

EXHIBIT 4A. PRESENTED BY HAWAII EQUAL RIGHTS COMMISSION

COMPARATIVE TABLE OF INTERNAL-REVENUE COLLECTIONS, 1944 AND 1945¹

(Collections in Hawaii exceed those in 14 States)

The total internal-revenue collections of Hawaii for the first years 1944 and 1945 exceeded the total collections of any one of the States listed below:

	1944	1945		1944	1945
Arizona.....	\$68,997,628.36	\$71,282,174.97	New Mexico.....	\$37,231,510.85	\$37,685,762.63
Arkansas.....	92,295,537.88	98,538,418.24	North Dakota.....	34,606,521.35	41,473,969.46
Idaho.....	58,762,651.18	59,805,443.67	South Dakota.....	37,369,830.24	37,981,520.17
Mississippi.....	88,166,356.88	91,060,202.92	Utah.....	85,919,652.36	84,635,051.07
Montana.....	56,834,470.47	61,653,136.69	Vermont.....	52,202,782.29	52,495,261.06
Maine.....	147,911,537.72	150,087,932.57	Wyoming.....	28,945,976.79	29,410,347.68
Nevada.....	35,701,575.99	33,862,403.96	Hawaii.....	150,781,309.54	173,999,227.22
New Hampshire..	74,135,674.20	81,153,495.50			

¹ For prior years see the 1937 report of the Joint Committee on Hawaii, S. Doc. No. 151, 75th Cong., 3d sess., p. 15. For 1937 Hawaii exceeded these 14 States and 3 others: South Carolina, Alabama, and Oregon.

See pp. 288-289 for total collections and per capita collections for the fiscal year 1945, in the several States.

EXHIBIT 4C. PRESENTED BY HAWAII EQUAL RIGHTS COMMISSION

Internal-revenue collections, Hawaii and United States, 1941-44,¹ showing the type of revenue

Item	Fiscal year			
	1941	1942	1943	1944
Corporate income:				
Hawaii.....	\$4,939,932	\$9,406,248	\$13,203,257	\$41,827,015
United States.....	\$1,851,987,990	\$3,069,273,346	\$4,520,851,710	\$14,776,796,475
Percentage.....	0.267	0.306	0.29	0.283
Individual income:				
Hawaii.....	\$3,973,438	\$11,274,272	\$32,161,161	\$91,312,914
United States.....	\$1,417,655,127	\$3,262,800,390	\$5,943,916,978	\$18,261,005,410
Percentage.....	0.280	0.346	0.541	0.500
Total income taxes:				
Hawaii.....	\$8,913,370	\$20,680,520	\$45,364,418	\$133,139,930
United States.....	\$3,269,643,117	\$6,332,073,736	\$10,464,768,688	\$34,654,851,852
Percentage.....	0.273	0.327	0.433	0.384
Miscellaneous internal revenue: ²				
Hawaii.....	\$3,404,191	\$8,553,639	\$26,874,080	\$14,357,045
United States.....	\$3,174,608,800	\$5,530,432,938	\$10,407,912,774	\$5,291,039,059
Percentage.....	0.107	0.155	0.258	0.271
Employment taxes: ³				
Hawaii.....	\$1,673,805	\$3,182,750	\$4,243,765	\$3,284,363
United States.....	\$925,856,460	\$1,185,361,843	\$1,498,705,034	\$1,739,095,418
Percentage.....	0.181	0.269	0.283	0.188
Total internal revenue:				
Hawaii.....	\$13,991,366	\$32,416,909	\$76,482,263	\$150,781,309
United States.....	\$7,370,108,377	\$13,047,868,517	\$22,371,386,496	\$41,684,987,330
Percentage.....	0.19	0.248	0.342	0.361

¹ Annual Report, Secretary of the Treasury, fiscal year ended June 30, 1944.

² Includes excess-profits tax.

³ Includes carrier taxes.

EXHIBIT 4D. PRESENTED BY HAWAII EQUAL RIGHTS COMMISSION

COMPARATIVE TABLE OF INDIVIDUAL INCOME-TAX RETURNS, 1940, SHOWING PERCENTAGE OF POPULATION FILING INDIVIDUAL RETURNS

The percentage of the population filing individual income-tax returns for 1940 was higher in Hawaii than in 26 States. The percentages are given in the following table:

Alabama.....	3.52	Nebraska.....	8.05
Arkansas.....	2.54	New Mexico.....	5.47
Arizona.....	8.58	North Carolina.....	3.59
Colorado.....	9.68	North Dakota.....	6.10
Florida.....	7.33	Oklahoma.....	4.80
Georgia.....	4.13	South Carolina.....	3.34
Idaho.....	8.26	South Dakota.....	5.90
Iowa.....	9.91	Tennessee.....	4.74
Kansas.....	7.16	Texas.....	7.10
Kentucky.....	4.62	Utah.....	7.15
Louisiana.....	5.42	Vermont.....	9.55
Maine.....	8.30	West Virginia.....	6.56
Mississippi.....	2.16	Hawaii.....	10.11
Missouri.....	8.65		

NOTE.—Figures taken from the Statistical Abstract of the United States.

In 1945 46.51 percent of Hawaii's population filed individual income-tax returns.

EXHIBIT 4E. PRESENTED BY HAWAII EQUAL RIGHTS COMMISSION

Collections United States internal revenue, district of Hawaii, 1900 to 1945

Fiscal year:	Amount	Fiscal year:	Amount
1900, June 11 to 30, inclusive.....	\$327.82	1924.....	\$5,795,242.95
1901.....	102,182.63	1925.....	5,749,433.32
1902.....	70,235.22	1926.....	6,797,074.95
1903.....	40,090.45	1927.....	5,330,995.97
1904.....	44,632.82	1928.....	6,244,381.78
1905.....	44,230.43	1929.....	5,606,513.83
1906.....	42,750.93	1930.....	5,515,911.69
1907.....	48,274.06	1931.....	4,816,475.31
1908.....	56,828.14	1932.....	3,785,879.08
1909.....	79,107.99	1933.....	3,067,249.39
1910.....	209,132.51	1934.....	5,735,328.81
1911.....	218,739.14	1935.....	5,652,574.06
1912.....	266,225.42	1936.....	7,980,400.63
1913.....	240,553.38	1937.....	11,633,487.56
1914.....	246,754.46	1938.....	14,286,676.20
1915.....	434,582.62	1939.....	11,766,670.72
1916.....	694,137.85	1940.....	9,721,626.41
1917.....	1,534,675.38	1941.....	13,763,998.48
1918.....	9,686,840.94	1942.....	32,067,927.62
1919.....	5,831,933.19	1943.....	75,996,558.49
1920.....	11,927,545.81	1944.....	149,643,817.00
1921.....	20,676,778.31	1945.....	172,443,857.23
1922.....	15,520,853.98		
1923.....	4,123,987.47		
		Total collections..	635,549,799.91

EXHIBIT 4F. PRESENTED BY HAWAII EQUAL RIGHTS COMMISSION

Expenditures made by the Federal Government as direct payments to States and Territories under cooperative arrangements and expenditures within the States and Territories which provided relief and other aid, total payments and payments to Territory of Hawaii, fiscal year 1944

Type of payment	Payments to Hawaii	Total, United States and Territories
A. DIRECT PAYMENTS UNDER COOPERATIVE ARRANGEMENTS		
Department of Agriculture:		
1. Agricultural experiment stations.....	\$97,374	\$6,946,439
2. Agricultural extension work ¹	126,071	20,583,198
3. Supply and distribution of farm labor.....	16,000	5,850,893
4. Forest funds, etc. ²	3,573	5,684,231
5. Roads and trails ³		2,475,655
6. Payments to counties from submarginal land program.....		75,280
Department of the Interior:		
7. Wildlife restoration ⁴		1,202,106
8. Payments from receipts under Mineral Leasing Act.....		2,698,035
9. Payments under certain special funds ⁵		2,012,245
Executive Office:		
10. War Shipping Administration, State marine schools ⁶		154,860
Federal Power Commission:		
11. Payments to States under Federal Power Act.....		50,061
Veterans' Administration:		
12. State and Territorial homes for disabled soldiers and sailors.....		1,119,200
Federal Security Agency:		
13. Office of Vocational Rehabilitation.....	28,617	4,708,163
14. Office of Education, colleges for agriculture and mechanic arts.....	74,831	5,030,000
15. Office of Education, cooperative vocational education and rehabilitation.....	103,580	21,699,386
16. American Printing House for the Blind.....	866	125,000
17. Payments to States under social security program ⁷	508,964	451,380,217
Department of Labor:		
18. Payments to States under social security program.....	92,064	11,158,076
19. Emergency maternity and infant care.....	18,100	29,845,839
Federal Works Agency:		
20. Public roads, highways ⁸	705,763	39,969,947
21. Total direct payments.....	1,776,307	612,868,891
B. GRANTS TO AND EXPENDITURES WITHIN STATES AND TERRITORIES PROVIDING DIRECT RELIEF, WORK RELIEF, AND OTHER AID, EXCLUSIVE OF LOANS		
Department of Agriculture:		
22. Farm Security Administration, War Housing.....		173,595
23. Farm Security Administration, other ⁹	1,496	34,833,839
24. Agricultural adjustment program.....	8,733,437	701,301,560
25. Forest roads and trails.....		5,637,735
Department of the Interior:		
26. Territories and island possessions ¹⁰		165,893

¹ Includes \$1,815,649 for emergency extension work, War Food Administration programs.

² Comprises \$26,887.91 under payments to school funds, Arizona and New Mexico; \$5,562,386.22 under forest-fire cooperation; and \$104,956.93 under farm and other private forestry cooperation.

³ Represents payments to States and Territories from national forests fund.

⁴ Comprises \$1,133,546.67 under Wildlife Restoration Act; \$43,441.31 under Migratory Bird Act; and \$25,118.12 under Alaska game law.

⁵ Comprises \$600,000 to Arizona and Nevada under Boulder Canyon Adjustment Act of July 19, 1940; \$680,363.43 payments to counties, Oregon and California grant lands; \$270,060.04 payments to counties in lieu of taxes on Oregon and California grant lands, 25 percent fund; \$17,380.44 payments to Coos and Douglas Counties, Ore., in lieu of taxes on Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands; \$344,699.56 payments to States from potash deposits; \$97,581.82 payments to States under Grazing Act of June 28, 1934; and \$2,160.52 payments to States of 5 percent of net proceeds from sales of public lands.

⁶ Transferred from Navy Department to Executive Office, Office for Emergency Management, War Shipping Administration, by Executive Order No. 9198, dated July 11, 1942.

⁷ Comprises \$440,540,265.16 payments by Social Security Board and \$10,389,952.83 by Public Health Service. The payments by Social Security Board include \$35,229,255.87 for administration of unemployment compensation as provided under title III of the Social Security Act, and \$369,298.23 for enemy alien and civilian war assistance.

⁸ Comprises \$35,625,043.15 for Federal-aid highway system (regular), \$4,054,026.51 for Federal-aid secondary or feeder roads (regular), and \$290,876.29 for restoration of roads and bridges and flood relief (regular).

⁹ Excludes war housing activities (stated separately) and rural rehabilitation loans of \$67,443,787.99; farm tenancy loans of \$24,074,253.68; water facilities loans of \$773,323.92; flood and windstorm damage loans of \$1,903,510.12; and \$55,314.07 from emergency funds for the President for loans incidental to evacuation of enemy aliens.

¹⁰ Expenditures in Puerto Rico were made from the account "Emergency relief, Interior, Puerto Rico Reconstruction Administration." Expenditures in Virgin Islands were from the account "Defraying deficits in treasuries of the municipal government, Virgin Islands, 1944."

Expenditures made by the Federal Government as direct payments to States and Territories under cooperative arrangements and expenditures within the States and Territories which provided relief and other aid, total payments and payments to Territory of Hawaii, fiscal year 1944—Continued

Type of payment	Payments to Hawaii	Total, United States and Territories
B. GRANTS TO AND EXPENDITURES WITHIN STATES AND TERRITORIES PROVIDING DIRECT RELIEF, WORK RELIEF, AND OTHER AID, EXCLUSIVE OF LOANS		
War Department:		
27. National Guard.....		\$244, 909
Federal Security Agency:		
28. Training of nurses.....		49, 942, 166
29. Public Health Service.....	\$24, 372	9, 702, 282
30. Office of Education, training of defense workers.....	71, 380	81, 239, 635
Federal Works Agency: ¹¹		
31. Highways, forest highways.....		878, 914
32. Highways, Public Roads Administration ¹²	1, 886, 080	104, 150, 075
33. Public Works Administration.....		4, 325, 592
34. Public Buildings Administration ¹³	34, 077	19, 698, 709
35. Work relief in Puerto Rico and Virgin Islands.....		5, 484, 084
36. Office of the Administrator, war public works.....	592, 292	121, 331, 969
National Housing Agency:		
37. Federal Public Housing Authority, annual contributions.....	13, 829	10, 131, 076
38. Total direct relief, and other aid.....	11, 356, 967	1, 149, 242, 041
39. Grand total.....	13, 133, 274	1, 762, 110, 932

¹¹ The Federal Works Agency has reported expenditures in the fiscal year 1944 of \$2,349,577.54 for liquidation of the Works Progress Administration, which are not included in this table.

¹² Comprises \$5,893,849.28 for elimination of grade crossings (regular); \$38,693.47 for highways and \$480,830.27 for elimination of grade crossings (emergency relief funds); \$7,670.62 National Industrial Recovery Act funds; and \$167,864.20 for public lands highways. Also includes \$97,561,167.50 for access roads, flight strips, strategic highway network, and surveys and plans classified as war activities.

¹³ Comprises \$19,420,835.89 for sites and construction and major alterations (regular); \$127,767.24 for sites and construction and major alterations (emergency funds) and \$150,076.46 for sites and construction and major alterations (emergency funds for the President). Included in the first amount is \$16,287,439.65 classified as war activities.

Source: Annual Report, Secretary of the Treasury, 1944, pp. 825-832.

EXHIBIT 4G. PRESENTED BY THE HAWAII EQUAL RIGHTS COMMISSION

Expenditures made by the Federal Government as direct payments to the States and Territories under cooperative arrangements and expenditures within States and Territories which provided relief and other aid, fiscal year, 1944

States	Direct payments under cooperative arrangements	Expenditures for relief and other aid, exclusive of loans	Total
Alabama.....	\$7, 276, 119. 22	\$27, 059, 687. 79	\$34, 335, 807. 01
Arizona.....	5, 056, 705. 09	5, 926, 178. 71	10, 982, 883. 80
Arkansas.....	6, 786, 328. 19	18, 352, 076. 52	25, 138, 404. 71
California.....	53, 936, 943. 04	60, 832, 931. 50	114, 769, 874. 54
Colorado.....	12, 685, 762. 33	16, 301, 406. 51	28, 987, 168. 84
Connecticut.....	5, 745, 915. 88	6, 158, 456. 37	11, 904, 372. 25
Delaware.....	1, 029, 135. 25	2, 086, 563. 13	3, 115, 698. 38
District of Columbia.....	1, 707, 556. 82	10, 140, 651. 65	11, 848, 208. 47
Florida.....	9, 416, 731. 00	20, 490, 866. 62	29, 907, 597. 62
Georgia.....	10, 930, 040. 35	27, 522, 222. 68	38, 452, 262. 93
Idaho.....	4, 724, 652. 55	13, 636, 676. 77	18, 361, 329. 32
Illinois.....	44, 205, 990. 49	60, 855, 877. 37	105, 061, 867. 86
Indiana.....	16, 308, 763. 17	32, 418, 371. 21	48, 727, 124. 38
Iowa.....	12, 435, 320. 07	50, 358, 687. 78	62, 794, 007. 85
Kansas.....	9, 048, 992. 89	43, 715, 715. 46	52, 764, 708. 35
Kentucky.....	7, 860, 104. 68	18, 328, 418. 37	26, 188, 523. 05
Louisiana.....	10, 412, 453. 15	27, 027, 719. 48	37, 440, 172. 63
Maine.....	4, 583, 531. 74	8, 493, 560. 99	13, 077, 092. 73
Maryland.....	5, 371, 500. 43	17, 898, 612. 42	23, 270, 112. 85
Massachusetts.....	23, 773, 795. 87	9, 046, 198. 80	32, 819, 994. 67
Michigan.....	27, 237, 085. 14	37, 449, 760. 74	64, 686, 845. 88

Expenditures made by the Federal Government as direct payments to the States and Territories under cooperative arrangements and expenditures within States and Territories which provided relief and other aid, fiscal year 1944—Continued

States	Direct payments under cooperative arrangements	Expenditures for relief and other aid, exclusive of loans	Total
Minnesota.....	\$15,869,691.37	\$32,203,479.07	\$48,073,170.44
Mississippi.....	5,417,943.86	23,346,971.10	28,764,914.96
Missouri.....	21,520,277.87	32,558,179.70	54,078,457.57
Montana.....	3,996,256.96	16,842,182.41	20,838,439.37
Nebraska.....	7,126,391.04	35,248,320.34	42,374,711.38
Nevada.....	1,834,930.09	2,392,302.14	4,227,232.23
New Hampshire.....	2,321,076.80	1,718,518.45	4,039,595.25
New Jersey.....	10,371,760.17	11,489,310.88	21,861,071.05
New Mexico.....	4,233,782.19	6,177,093.43	10,410,875.62
New York.....	39,387,132.32	33,044,226.89	72,431,359.21
North Carolina.....	8,413,272.87	27,221,830.22	35,635,103.09
North Dakota.....	3,768,584.40	24,625,585.59	28,394,169.99
Ohio.....	34,106,398.65	41,984,672.73	76,091,071.38
Oklahoma.....	18,231,705.68	30,362,001.56	48,593,707.24
Oregon.....	8,260,172.89	17,611,770.26	25,871,943.15
Pennsylvania.....	29,919,020.45	33,177,128.17	63,096,148.62
Rhode Island.....	2,673,802.59	2,761,490.81	5,435,293.40
South Carolina.....	5,529,439.29	17,369,796.67	22,899,235.96
South Dakota.....	3,847,011.25	19,053,922.14	22,900,933.39
Tennessee.....	10,775,230.82	19,848,930.54	30,624,161.36
Texas.....	33,956,555.43	71,736,772.62	105,693,328.05
Utah.....	5,487,067.60	9,710,873.73	15,197,941.33
Vermont.....	1,725,984.81	1,576,879.49	3,302,864.30
Virginia.....	5,972,430.24	30,474,723.66	36,447,153.90
Washington.....	20,289,252.93	30,389,771.17	50,679,024.10
West Virginia.....	5,927,612.55	6,835,934.46	12,763,547.01
Wisconsin.....	13,954,565.71	18,911,693.60	32,866,259.31
Wyoming.....	2,681,920.13	4,253,691.23	6,935,611.36
Alaska.....	647,690.38	761,226.29	1,408,916.67
Hawaii ¹	1,776,307.01	11,356,967.11	13,133,274.12
Canal Zone.....	559,230.00	559,280.00
Puerto Rico.....	2,109,177.04	17,583,296.70	19,692,473.74
Virgin Islands.....	229,041.46	229,041.46
Undistributed.....	202,958.38	1,723,536.28	1,926,494.66
Total.....	612,868,891.12	1,149,242,041.67	1,762,110,932.79

¹ Hawaii exceeds 12 States. Compare exhibit 4A showing that Hawaii exceeds 14 States in internal-revenue payments.

Source: Annual Report, Secretary of the Treasury, 1944.

EXHIBIT 4H. PRESENTED BY THE HAWAII EQUAL RIGHTS COMMISSION

Federal grants and expenditures to States and Territory of Hawaii, on per capita basis, by rank of States, 1940

State	Grants and expenditures		State	Grants and expenditures	
	Per capita amount	Rank		Per capita amount	Rank
Nevada.....	\$38.68	1	Arkansas.....	\$39.68	16
Montana.....	81.46	2	Minnesota.....	*38.13	17
North Dakota.....	79.02	3	Mississippi.....	36.93	18
Wyoming.....	78.22	4	Hawaii.....	36.53	19
South Dakota.....	75.39	5	Washington.....	35.20	20
Idaho.....	69.96	6	Texas.....	35.14	21
Nebraska.....	59.71	7	Missouri.....	32.96	22
New Mexico.....	56.89	8	South Carolina.....	31.43	23
Colorado.....	54.48	9	Louisiana.....	31.36	24
Arizona.....	51.49	10	Indiana.....	31.20	25
Utah.....	48.63	11	Wisconsin.....	29.82	26
Iowa.....	42.56	12	Illinois.....	29.90	27
Kansas.....	42.04	13	Alabama.....	29.75	28
Oregon.....	40.88	14	California.....	27.91	29
Oklahoma.....	39.92	15	Ohio.....	27.28	30

Federal grants and expenditures to States and Territory of Hawaii, on per capita basis, by rank of States, 1940—Continued

State	Grants and expenditures		State	Grants and expenditures	
	Per capita amount	Rank		Per capita amount	Rank
Massachusetts.....	\$26.75	31	Delaware.....	\$22.44	41
New Hampshire.....	26.46	32	Maine.....	21.91	42
Georgia.....	25.99	33	New Jersey.....	21.76	43
Vermont.....	25.60	34	Pennsylvania.....	21.39	44
Rhode Island.....	25.43	35	North Carolina.....	21.06	45
Michigan.....	25.13	36	Connecticut.....	19.28	46
Florida.....	24.98	37	Maryland.....	18.80	47
West Virginia.....	24.29	38	New York.....	18.17	48
Tennessee.....	23.06	39	Virginia.....	17.23	49
Kentucky.....	22.56	40			

Source: Federal, State, and Local Government Fiscal Relations, S. Doc. No. 69, 78th Cong., 1st sess., p. 222. Hawaii per capita data compiled on same basis from Annual Report of Secretary of the Treasury 1940.

EXHIBIT 41. PRESENTED BY THE HAWAII EQUAL RIGHTS COMMISSION

United States customs receipts in the Territory of Hawaii 1901-44, inclusive

1901.....	\$1, 219, 338. 79	1924.....	\$1, 454, 088. 75
1902.....	1, 327, 518. 23	1925.....	1, 773, 106. 91
1903.....	1, 193, 677. 83	1926.....	1, 663, 683. 21
1904.....	1, 229, 467. 61	1927.....	1, 613, 989. 21
1905.....	1, 043, 340. 38	1928.....	1, 804, 139. 76
1906.....	1, 218, 764. 13	1929.....	1, 954, 228. 23
1907.....	1, 458, 843. 48	1930.....	1, 784, 863. 01
1908.....	1, 550, 157. 32	1931.....	1, 812, 689. 78
1909.....	1, 396, 379. 91	1932.....	1, 480, 013. 01
1910.....	1, 575, 319. 15	1933.....	1, 314, 353. 69
1911.....	1, 654, 776. 38	1934.....	1, 360, 991. 86
1912.....	1, 643, 197. 24	1935.....	1, 637, 351. 22
1913.....	1, 775, 519. 59	1936.....	1, 709, 566. 51
1914.....	1, 107, 377. 58	1937.....	2, 762, 787. 00
1915.....	948, 262. 79	1938.....	2, 458, 214. 42
1916.....	1, 080, 147. 42	1939.....	2, 190, 580. 46
1917.....	961, 302. 70	1940.....	2, 260, 693. 95
1918.....	890, 565. 89	1941.....	2, 147, 089. 44
1919.....	796, 906. 25	1942.....	1, 130, 317. 73
1920.....	1, 086, 627. 59	1943.....	495, 555. 06
1921.....	1, 346, 731. 96	1944.....	1, 319, 661. 74
1922.....	978, 529. 68		
1923.....	1, 409, 517. 75	Total.....	65, 020, 234. 60

Source : Figures from U. S. Customs Office, Honolulu.

EXHIBIT 4J. PRESENTED BY THE HAWAII EQUAL RIGHTS COMMISSION

Post-office receipts at Honolulu, T. H.

1900	\$79,896.42	1923	\$335,403.76
1901	104,651.73	1924	367,114.26
1902	72,422.35	1925	434,946.70
1903	80,984.51	1926	444,962.70
1904	83,106.66	1927	456,181.96
1905	82,335.86	1928	504,237.38
1906	96,488.38	1929	521,790.23
1907	104,388.75	1930	544,938.06
1908	107,448.91	1931	548,334.57
1909	120,826.90	1932	579,969.23
1910	126,839.21	1933	548,093.17
1911	137,877.27	1934	559,558.07
1912	157,608.04	1935	587,746.52
1913	173,269.38	1936	677,890.98
1914	179,905.53	1937	892,682.93
1915	180,316.69	1938	915,740.47
1916	268,163.25	1939	980,623.97
1917	299,009.52	1940	1,363,341.27
1918	349,957.10	1941	2,097,379.46
1919	377,975.30	1942	2,691,637.27
1920	219,649.14	1943	5,038,063.38
1921	303,227.31	1944	14,998,562.84
1922	315,116.11		

Source : Figures from report of U. S. Post Office Department.

EXHIBIT 5D. PRESENTED BY THE HAWAII EQUAL RIGHTS COMMISSION

Bonded debt of the Territory of Hawaii and the 4 counties as of Dec. 31, 1945

[For further statistics as to the financial condition of the Territory and its political subdivisions, see exhibits 45 and 46]

Territory of Hawaii:

Public improvement term bonds	\$3,780,000
Public improvement serial bonds	2,960,000
Refunding serial bonds	9,780,000
Total	16,520,000
Less sinking fund for the redemption of bonded debt	7,151,344
Net amount	9,368,656

City and county of Honolulu:

A. General county bonds:

Improvement term bonds	1,000,000
Improvement serial bonds	5,009,000
Refunding serial bonds	530,000

Total	6,539,000
Less sinking fund for the redemption of bonded debt	491,057

Net amount	6,047,943
------------	-----------

B. Suburban water serial revenue bonds	1,256,000
--	-----------

C. Board of water supply serial revenue bonds	3,195,000
---	-----------

County of Maui: Public improvement serial bonds	848,000
---	---------

County of Hawaii: Improvement serial bonds	603,000
--	---------

County of Kauai: Public improvement serial bonds	761,000
--	---------

Source : Territorial treasurer's office, Jan. 3, 1946.

EXHIBIT 5E. PRESENTED BY THE HAWAII EQUAL RIGHTS COMMISSION

Chart of Territorial tax system, effective as of July 1, 1945

(See 81 for amounts of taxes collected by tax commissioner and treasurer. See exhibit 57 for real property tax rates. Exhibit 45d shows how taxes are distributed)

[Reference to Revised Laws of 1945]

A. ADMINISTERED BY TAX COMMISSIONER

Kind of tax	Measure and rate of tax	Reports	Tax payable
1. Real property, ch. 94, secs. 5101-5170.	<p>(1) Date of lien: Jan. 1.</p> <p>(2) Measure of assessment: (A) Fair and reasonable value, assessed to owner or owners; (B) buildings replacement less depreciation.</p> <p>(3) Rate: Varies for divisions.</p> <p>(1) Date of lien: Jan. 1.</p> <p>(2) Measure of assessment: (A) Goods, wares, and merchandise on average value of preceding 12 months or fraction thereof; (B) machinery, equipment, and furniture and fixtures replacement value less depreciation; (C) other at fair and reasonable value. NOTE.—Only tangible personal property in commercial activity subject to assessment.</p> <p>(3) Rate: Varies for divisions.</p> <p>(1) Period covered by return.</p> <p>(2) Entire net income from all property owned and every trade or business carried on in the Territory and compensation paid for or attributable to personal services performed within the Territory.</p> <p>(3) Rates: Corporations, 7½ percent; individuals, graduated 2 to 5 percent.</p> <p>(4) Tax credit: 75 percent of the 2-percent tax withheld from, or paid by taxpayers in respect to compensation and dividends included in the net income-tax returns as gross income subject to tax.</p> <p>(1) Nature of tax: In lieu of gross income and ad valorem real- and personal-property taxes.</p> <p>(2) Measure of assessment: Gross revenue from public-utility business of public utilities for preceding calendar year.</p> <p>(3) Rate: If ratio of net to gross income is 15 percent or less, 5 percent; for each 1-percent increase in ratio of net to gross, rate increases ¼ of 1 percent.</p> <p>Distributors as defined in sec. 5401 are required to pay 4 cents per gallon of liquid fuel other than Diesel oil, and 1 cent per gallon of Diesel oil sold or used in the Territory. Distributors or others who shall use Diesel oil in motor vehicles on public highways must pay an additional 3 cents per gallon on Diesel oil so used.</p>	<p>Returns filed, if required, on or before Jan. 31. Notices of assessments to taxpayers not later than Apr. 1. Appeals not later than Apr. 20. Net assessable set on or before May 1.</p> <p>Returns filed on or before Feb. 28. Returns must be audited before the end of calendar year following the year in which returns are made.</p> <p>Returns filed on or before Mar. 20, or 20th of third month after close of fiscal year.</p> <p>Returns filed on or before Mar. 20.</p> <p>Returns are due monthly on or before the 30th day of the following month.</p>	<p>First half on or before June 20. Second half on or before Nov. 20. Taxes payable on assessor's value.</p> <p>1 percent upon filing on declared value. First installment on or before June 20. Second installment on or before Nov. 20.</p> <p>First installment at time of filing return. Other installments on 20th of third, sixth, and ninth months thereafter.</p> <p>Do.</p> <p>At the time of filing of the monthly return.</p>
2. Personal property, ch. 105, secs. 5631-5647.			
3. Net income, ch. 102, secs. 5501-5541.			
4. Public utility, ch. 106, secs. 5671-5676.			
5. Liquid fuel, ch. 100, secs. 5401-5416.			

Chart of Territorial tax system, effective as of July 1, 1945—Continued

Kind of tax	Measure and rate of tax	Reports	Tax payable
6. Compensation and dividend, ch. 98, secs. 5341-5359.	(1) Method of collection: Employers and local corporations required to withhold from compensation and dividends paid. (2) Measure of assessment: (A) Gross compensation paid for or attributable to personal services performed within the Territory, including certain fees and other payments in the form of compensation; (B) dividends distributed out of earnings or profits by local corporations and dividends received by local residents from foreign corporations.	Returns filed on or before the 20th day of the succeeding calendar month.	At the time of filing of the monthly return.
7. Bank excise, ch. 97, secs. 5301-5323.	(1) (A) Assessment date: Jan. 1. (B) Nature of tax: In lieu of all taxes except real property tax. (2) Measure of assessment: Based on taxable value of shares of domestic banks and on fair and reasonable value of property and business of foreign banks (net worth of bank as enterprise for profit). (3) Rate: At such as will produce total annual revenue of \$50,000. "Dealers" as defined in sec. 5501 and certain others who sell liquor to a "purchaser" as defined in sec. 5501 must pay an excise tax equal to 6 percent of the ordinary, or usual retail price. A \$1 liquor-tax permit is required and must be renewed before July 1 of each year. "Wholesalers" as defined in sec. 5751 and certain others must pay an excise tax of 8 percent of wholesale prices on wholesale sales, and 8 percent of wholesale purchase prices on retail sales, also 6 percent of retail prices on products used. A \$1 tobacco-tax permit is required and must be renewed before July 1 of each year.	Returns filed on or before Feb. 1	{ First half on or before June 20. Second half on or before Nov. 20.
8. Liquor, ch. 104, secs. 5601-5618.	This is a business-privilege tax measured by gross proceeds of sales or gross income. The tax rate is $\frac{1}{4}$ percent on wholesaling, producing, and manufacturing, except sugar producers and canneries who are taxed at the rate of $1\frac{1}{2}$ percent which is also the applicable rate on all other taxable gross receipts. A \$1 license must be secured and renewed annually on a calendar year basis.	Returns filed by 20th of month following taxable month.	At time of filing of the monthly return.
9. Tobacco, ch. 109, secs. 5751-5765.	This is a business-privilege tax measured by gross proceeds of sales or gross income. The tax rate is $\frac{1}{4}$ percent on wholesaling, producing, and manufacturing, except sugar producers and canneries who are taxed at the rate of $1\frac{1}{2}$ percent which is also the applicable rate on all other taxable gross receipts. A \$1 license must be secured and renewed annually on a calendar year basis.	do	Do.
10. Gross income (general), excise tax law, ch. 101, secs. 5441-5482.	This is an excise tax which applies on the value of imported tangible personal property, for use or consumption, if purchased from anyone not taxable under the gross income tax law. There is a monthly exemption of \$100, and the tax rate is $1\frac{1}{4}$ percent of fair and reasonable value (landed cost).	Returns are due and the tax payable on or before the 20th day of the following month. An annual summary and reconciliation return must be filed on or before Mar. 20 of each year.	At time of filing of the monthly return, also when annual return is filed if additional tax is due.
11. Consumption (consumer's tax), ch. 99, secs. 5371-5389.	This is an excise tax which applies on the value of imported tangible personal property, for use or consumption, if purchased from anyone not taxable under the gross income tax law. There is a monthly exemption of \$100, and the tax rate is $1\frac{1}{4}$ percent of fair and reasonable value (landed cost).	Returns are due and the tax payable on or before the 20th day of the following month. An annual return is due on or before Mar. 20 of each year. These returns have been consolidated with the gross income-tax returns and are filed simultaneously	At time of filing of the monthly return.

12. Unemployment compensation (Federal), ch. 74, secs. 4246-4261.	(1) Date of lien: Last day of following month. (2) Measure of assessment: Based on gross payments to 1 or more employees with certain exceptions. (3) Rate: 2.7 percent of tax base. Collected by tax commissioner for division of unemployment compensation.	Returns filed by last day of the month following the taxable month.	At time of filing of the monthly return.
---	---	---	--

OTHER TERRITORIAL REVENUE LAWS

B. ADMINISTERED BY TERRITORIAL TREASURER

Kind of tax	Measure and rate of tax	Reports
1. Inheritance and estate taxes, ch. 103, secs. 5551-5592.....	Tax on net valuation of deceased estate at various rates.....	Filed with treasurer on Territorial forms.
2. Insurance tax, ch. 161, secs. 8487-8488.....	Based on annual premium collected, rate, 2½ percent.....	Filed with treasurer on Apr. 15 of each year on Territory of Hawaii.
3. Miscellaneous licenses.....	Depending on class of business.....	

C. ADMINISTERED BY COUNTIES

1. Vehicle-weight tax, ch. 108, secs. 5704-5712.....	½ cent on private cars, 1 cent on commercial cars.....	Annually before Mar. 1.
2. Dog tax, ch. 134, secs. 7152-7154.....	\$1 per license.....	Annual.
3. Bicycle tax, ch. 108, secs. 5702-5703.....	do.....	Do.
4. Miscellaneous license.....	Depending on class of business.....	

EXHIBIT 5F. PRESENTED BY THE HAWAII EQUAL RIGHTS COMMISSION

Assessed value of real and personal property, 1945

Taxation division	Real property	Personal property	Total 1945	Total 1944
First, city and county of Honolulu.....	\$407,755,486	\$82,756,199	\$490,511,685	\$482,542,729
Second, county of Maui.....	31,261,805	17,403,303	48,665,108	48,358,411
Third, county of Hawaii.....	43,005,515	19,771,041	62,776,556	62,832,541
Fourth, county of Kauai.....	18,471,032	14,472,574	32,943,606	31,740,123
Total.....	500,493,838	134,403,117	634,896,955	625,473,804

Source: Territorial tax commissioner.

EXHIBIT 6A. PRESENTED BY THE HAWAII EQUAL RIGHTS COMMISSION

*Number of business establishments, Territory of Hawaii, by calendar years—
Gross income licenses issued by tax commissioner*

Year	Territory of Hawaii	First division, Oahu	Second division, Maui	Third division, Hawaii	Fourth division, Kauai
1935.....	25,825	13,494	3,082	7,786	1,463
1936.....	26,165	14,110	3,400	7,075	1,580
1937.....	24,450	13,934	2,915	6,156	1,445
1938.....	24,893	14,440	2,967	6,091	1,395
1939.....	26,190	15,335	3,273	6,144	1,438
1940.....	28,063	16,864	3,468	6,187	1,544
1941.....	29,929	18,945	3,337	6,105	1,542
1942.....	30,082	18,324	3,597	6,111	2,050
1943.....	33,205	19,462	4,027	7,357	2,359
1944.....	34,668	20,933	4,049	7,582	2,104
1945 ¹	36,875	23,390	4,037	7,476	1,972

¹ 11 months of 1945.

Source: Territorial tax commissioner.

EXHIBIT 6B. PRESENTED BY THE HAWAII EQUAL RIGHTS COMMISSION

*Number of persons (including corporations) engaged in various types of business
as of December 1945, as shown by records of Bureau of Gross Income Taxes,
Territorial Tax Office*

Activity	First division, Oahu	Second division, Maui	Third division, Hawaii	Fourth division, Kauai	Territorial all divisions
Retailing.....	7,908	1,608	2,345	1,057	12,918
Sugar processing and canning.....	97	1	41	3	142
Producing.....	2,539	520	4,722	527	8,358
Wholesaling.....	1,895	607	377	120	2,999
Manufacturing.....	675	48	687	16	1,426
Printing and publishing.....	105	7	6	5	123
Services other than professional.....	7,604	1,374	2,212	794	11,984
Professional services.....	679	56	92	40	867
Contracting.....	1,185	57	74	25	1,341
Theaters, amusements, and radio broadcasting.....	679	87	116	52	934
Interest.....	110	46	63	3	222
Commissions.....	1,264	109	182	49	1,604
Rentals.....	9,248	699	1,136	321	11,404
All other income.....	25	34	31	-----	90
Total.....	34,063	5,253	12,084	3,012	54,412

Number of persons (including corporations) engaged in various types of business as of December 1945, as shown by records of Bureau of Gross Income Taxes, Territorial Tax Office—Continued

RECAPITULATION OF GROSS INCOME TAX ACTIVITIES AS OF DECEMBER 1945

RETAILING No. 1

Activity	First division, Oahu	Second division, Maui	Third division, Hawaii	Fourth division, Kauai	Territorial, all divi- sions
Antique and art.....	9				9
Appliances.....	51	9	2	4	66
Artists.....	18		1		19
Auto dealers.....	25	8	6	3	42
Auto supplies.....	47	11	7	4	69
Bakery.....	26	10	23	2	61
Barber supply.....	4				4
Barrooms and saloons.....	254	29	77	20	380
Block printing.....	8		1	2	11
Books and stationery.....	30	3	1		34
Bottle dealers.....	3		1		4
Bread dealers.....	8	3	15	9	35
Brushes.....	12				12
Building materials.....	7	2	1		10
Butcher.....	3		12		15
Cakes.....	5		19	2	26
Cans, empty.....					
Cattle.....	9	60	26		95
Charcoal.....	4	1	2	1	8
Chemicals.....	17				17
Cold drinks.....	112	35	29	30	206
Confectionery.....	121	15	34	35	205
Curtains and novelties.....	253	9	18	18	298
Cyclery.....	19	1		1	21
Department stores.....	12				12
Display fixtures.....	1				1
Drugs.....	119	8	15	9	151
Dry goods.....	128	32	23	39	222
Electric companies.....	3			1	3
Electric supplies.....	17				18
Equipment.....	38	1	2	2	43
Farms.....	32		162	1	195
Feed stores.....	13	73	2	1	89
Fertilizer, soil, etc.....	3				3
Firewood.....	7	12	12	1	32
Fish dealers and fish markets.....	235	108	81	108	532
Florists.....	116	5	21	11	153
Food products.....	287	92	68	34	481
Fountain and lunches.....	364	29	29	22	444
Fruit and vegetable stores.....	396	136	40	141	713
Furniture.....	76	3	10	2	91
General merchandise.....	534	170	334	97	1,135
Glassware.....	2				2
Grocery.....	546		45	50	641
Hardware.....	17	9	5	30	61
Hat stores.....	15	9	3		27
Hogs (undressed).....	81	103	66	8	258
Hot-dog stands.....	35		7		42
Household products.....	12			3	15
Ice.....	11	2		1	14
Irrigation companies.....	2				2
Jewelers.....	154	7	12	12	185
Junk.....	19	4	2	1	26
Kerosene and oil.....	13		2	1	16
Lauhala weaving.....	34	92	162	22	310
Lei seller.....	166	16	31	5	218
Liquor stores.....	68	24	69	12	173
Lumber.....	8		2		10
Lunch wagons.....	330			3	333
Meat dealers and meat markets.....	172	24	59	78	333
Mill supplies.....	11				11
Monument and sculptors.....	8		3		11
Music instruments.....	10	1	5	1	17
Music stores and composers.....	20	1	1	1	23
Newspapers.....	17	3	3	2	25
Nursery.....	59	11	17	1	88
Office equipment and supplies.....	25			2	27
Optical.....	16	1			17
Oriental goods.....	29				29
Paint.....	13			2	15
Pawn shops.....	3				3
Peddlers.....	377	30	122	2	531
Pet stores.....	13				13

Number of persons (including corporations) engaged in various types of business as of December 1945, as shown by records of Bureau of Gross Income Taxes, Territorial Tax Office—Continued

RETAILING, No. 1—Continued

Activity	First division, Oahu	Second division, Maui	Third division, Hawaii	Fourth division, Kauai	Territorial, all divisions
Picture and picture framing.....	43	1	5	1	50
Philatelics.....	9				9
Poi.....	29	19	18	8	74
Poultry.....	348	35	199	54	636
Radio and radio supplies.....	56	1	9	1	67
Ranch.....	1		49	3	53
Restaurants.....	723	62	123	44	952
Rock quarries.....	4			3	7
Saimin and noodles.....	88		2	3	93
Second-hand dealers.....	29			2	31
Service stations.....	218	56	83	30	387
Sewing machine companies.....	14				14
Shoe stores.....	46	16	3	3	68
Sporting goods.....	12		1		13
Sundries.....	4		1	1	6
Supplies.....	49			5	54
Tea houses.....	15				15
Telephone.....	1				1
Tennis shop.....	6				6
Tire dealers.....	3		1	4	8
Tobacco, magazines.....	59		32	24	115
Toilet articles, cosmetics.....	39		12	4	55
Toys.....	16				16
Used cars.....	63		2		65
Vending stands.....	18				18
Water companies.....	4			1	5
Weaving apparel.....	140	6	11	15	172
Window supplies.....	6				6
Miscellaneous.....	181	210	105	14	490
Wholesale and retail.....	22				22
Total.....	7,908	1,608	2,345	1,057	12,918

SUGAR AND CANNING, No. 2

Canneries.....	9	1		1	11
Plantation, sugar.....	77		41	2	120
Sugar factories.....	11				11
Total, sugar and canning.....	97	1	41	3	142

PRODUCING, No. 3

Charcoal.....	4		6		10
Dairies.....	58		8		66
Farming.....	408		634	9	1,051
Fishing.....	182		119	49	350
Flower growers.....	131	2	76	5	214
Hog raisers.....	382		150	57	589
Honey.....	15		3	1	19
Rice.....	7			34	41
Laubala weaving.....	4		50		54
Poultry.....	365		404	42	811
Ranch.....	25		206	51	282
Sugar growers.....	26		2,099	10	2,135
Taro.....	66	62	43	27	198
Vegetables and fruits.....	915	370	57	199	1,542
Other producing.....		86	867	43	996
Total, producing.....	2,589	520	4,722	527	8,358

WHOLESALE, No. 4

Appliances.....	9	2	1	2	14
Auto dealers.....	12			2	14
Auto parts.....	23	4	5	4	36
Bakeries.....	51		4		55
Barber supplies.....	3				3
Beverages.....	5			6	11

Number of persons (including corporations) engaged in various types of business as of December 1945, as shown by records of Bureau of Gross Income Taxes, Territorial Tax Office—Continued

WHOLESALE, No. 4—Continued

Activity	First division, Oahu	Second division, Maui	Third division, Hawaii	Fourth division, Kauai	Territorial, all divisions
Bitumuls Co.	1				1
Block printing	16			3	19
Boat building, builders	10				10
Bottle dealers	21				21
Bread dealers	4				4
Building material	4	1	2		7
Charcoal	10			2	12
Chips	5				5
Cocanuts	7		1	1	9
Confectioneries	20			3	23
Curios and novelties	128	3	3	3	137
Draperies					
Drugs	36		2	1	39
Dry goods	36	1	3	2	42
Electrical appliances	18			1	19
Equipment	15	1			16
Feed	8			1	9
Fish dealers	114	111	42	8	275
Florists	36	1	3	1	41
Food products	99	7	2	1	109
Fruit and vegetable dealers	216	20	23	21	280
Furniture	20		5	1	26
General household utensils	1				1
General merchandise	189	23	49	3	264
Glass articles	1				1
Groceries	30		10	4	44
Hardware	8		1	3	12
Hat makers	2		2		4
Hog raisers	49	255	23	3	330
Household products	4			1	5
Jewelers	70				70
Junk dealers	7		1		8
Kerosene and oils	19		3		22
Lauhala weaving	24	48	93	1	166
Leather goods	6				6
Leis	9				9
Lumber	5	6		4	15
Magazines	7				7
Manufacturing agent	11				11
Meats	31		14	11	56
Merchants	3				3
Music, instruments, publishing	9				9
Oil distributors	12			1	13
Oriental goods	4				4
Peddlers	5				5
Perfumes	3				3
Poultry	111	67	10	2	190
Quarries	7			2	9
Second-hand	5				5
Sundries	2			1	3
Supplies	37				37
Tobacco, etc.	5			1	6
Toilet articles, cosmetics	10			1	11
Toys	10				10
Wearing apparel	27		2	3	32
All others (wholesale)	231		3	15	249
Miscellaneous	14	57	70	1	142
Total, wholesaling	1,895	607	377	120	2,999

MANUFACTURING, No. 5

Manufacturing	12				12
Alcoholic beverages	9		3		12
Bakery products	55	10	18	3	86
Block printing	16			1	17
Cane sugar	1		5		6
Chemical and fertilizer	30				30
Clothing	27				27
Coffee deparchmentizing	4		2		6
Concrete, lime, and stone products	11				11
Confectionery	18		2		20
Cosmetics	7				7

Number of persons (including corporations) engaged in various types of business as of December 1945, as shown by records of Bureau of Gross Income Taxes, Territorial Tax Office—Continued

MANUFACTURING, No. 5—Continued

Activity	First division, Oahu	Second division, Maui	Third division, Hawaii	Fourth division, Kauai	Territorial all divisions
Curios and novelties.....	88				88
Dental laboratories.....					
Foods.....	104	2	31		137
Footwear.....	7		11	3	21
Furniture.....	30		5		35
Jams and jellies.....	6				6
Jewelry.....	16				16
Macaroni and noodle.....	13				13
Machine-shop products.....	7				7
Mattresses and springs.....	10		2		12
Musical instruments.....	7				7
Newspapers and magazines.....	1				1
Nonalcoholic beverages.....	20	5	11	2	38
Neon signs.....	2				2
Pickled produce.....	3				3
Picture frames and venetian blinds.....	4				4
Planing-mill products.....	2				2
Shoyu.....	6	6		1	13
Soap.....	6		1		7
Sirup.....	3				3
Wood products.....	37				37
Miscellaneous.....	113	25	596	6	740
Total, manufacturing.....	675	48	687	16	1,426

PRINTING AND PUBLISHING, No. 6

Advertising, total.....	105	7	6	5	123
-------------------------	-----	---	---	---	-----

SERVICES OTHER THAN PROFESSIONAL, No. 7

Abstract business.....	3		21		24
Accounting and auditing.....	171	15		2	188
Advertising.....	18		2		20
Agent.....	9				9
Appraiser.....	5				5
Artists.....	30				30
Astrologists.....	4				4
Auctioneers.....	3				3
Auto fender shop.....	17				17
Auto paint shop.....	43	1		3	47
Auto polishing and washing.....	20				20
Auto repairing garage.....	310	28	64	33	435
Auto top shop.....	12	2	2	1	17
Barber shops.....	397	58	119	60	634
Bail bond.....	9		2		11
Baths.....	23	10	24	1	58
Battery service.....	4				4
Beach attendant.....	4				4
Beauticians.....	239	18	24	14	295
Blacksmith.....	9	4	6	2	21
Blueprinting.....	3				3
Bomb shelters.....	2				2
Booking agents.....	5				5
Bootblacks.....	106	6	7	5	124
Carpentry.....	88	13	18	19	138
Caterer.....	11				11
Chemist.....	3				3
Clubs.....	21				21
Collection agencies.....	20			2	23
Commercial arts.....	8				8
Communications.....	6				6
Cosmeticians.....	4		3		7
Court reporters.....	6				6
Crest designers.....	3				3
Customs broker.....	2				2
Cruising.....	13				13
Delivery service.....	6				6

Number of persons (including corporations) engaged in various types of business as of December 1945, as shown by records of Bureau of Gross Income Taxes, Territorial Tax Office—Continued

SERVICES OTHER THAN PROFESSIONAL, No. 7—Continued

Activity	First division, Oahu	Second division, Maui	Third division, Hawaii	Fourth division, Kauai	Territorial, all divisions
Designers.....	8	—	—	1	9
Detectives.....	3	—	—	—	3
Display service.....	2	—	—	—	2
Drafting.....	6	2	—	—	8
Draperies.....	6	—	—	—	6
Dressmakers, shirtmakers.....	820	189	214	131	1,354
Dry cleaners, carpet, etc.....	188	16	15	2	221
Electrical repair.....	116	—	9	4	129
Employment service.....	8	—	—	—	8
Engraving.....	35	—	—	—	35
Express and hauling.....	220	13	42	8	283
Furniture repairs.....	31	—	3	1	35
General business agents.....	44	—	—	—	44
General repairs.....	207	10	40	19	276
General service.....	314	—	31	3	348
General sewing.....	47	4	184	10	245
Goldsmiths.....	—	—	5	—	5
Information.....	1	—	—	1	2
Instructors.....	215	15	31	15	276
Interior decorators.....	13	1	—	—	14
Kindergarten.....	17	5	4	—	26
Landscaping.....	19	—	—	—	19
Laundry.....	541	611	620	281	2,053
Lecturer.....	1	—	—	—	1
Machine shops.....	3	—	2	—	5
Manicurists.....	9	—	—	—	9
Masseur.....	186	18	30	7	241
Mechanics.....	7	12	7	—	26
Midwives.....	25	3	8	1	37
Mortuary.....	9	3	4	1	17
Naturopaths.....	10	—	2	—	12
Notary public.....	245	59	55	22	381
Nurses.....	14	2	9	—	25
Nursing homes.....	4	—	—	—	4
Painters.....	36	2	10	1	49
Pharmacy.....	3	—	—	—	3
Photography.....	425	34	31	16	506
Physiotherapists.....	11	—	—	—	11
Piano tuning.....	3	1	—	1	5
Plating.....	1	—	—	—	1
Plumbing.....	22	4	11	7	44
Poultry.....	1	—	—	—	1
Public stenographer.....	28	—	—	—	28
Radio repairing.....	114	12	12	2	140
Railway companies.....	3	—	—	—	3
School.....	27	—	1	—	28
Shorthand reporter.....	1	—	—	—	1
Shoe repairing.....	75	4	19	2	100
Sign painter.....	35	4	3	—	42
Slaughterhouse.....	—	—	26	5	31
Stevedoring.....	7	—	—	—	7
Studios.....	31	—	—	—	31
Tailoring.....	192	63	69	58	382
Tattooing.....	26	—	—	1	27
Tax consultant.....	7	—	—	—	7
Taxi.....	1,222	69	71	27	1,389
Termite control.....	25	1	—	—	26
Tinsmith.....	12	3	4	2	21
Tire recapping and repair.....	11	1	1	—	13
Transportation.....	16	6	94	5	120
Upholstery.....	15	—	2	—	17
Warehousing.....	—	—	—	—	—
Watch repairing.....	105	12	15	10	142
Welding.....	34	—	2	—	36
Yard service.....	37	—	1	—	38
Other services.....	67	40	233	7	347
Total, services other than professional.....	7,604	1,374	2,212	794	11,984

Number of persons (including corporations) engaged in various types of business as of December 1945, as shown by records of Bureau of Gross Income Taxes, Territorial Tax Office—Continued

PROFESSIONAL SERVICES, No. 8

Activity	First division, Oahu	Second division, Maui	Third division, Hawaii	Fourth division, Kauai	Territorial, all divisions
Architects.....	40		1		41
Attorneys.....	105	14	16	4	139
Certified public accountant.....	11		1		12
Chiroprodists.....	12				12
Clinic.....	9				9
Dentists.....	153	12	27	10	202
Engineers.....	33		3		36
Optometrists.....	13	1	1	1	16
Osteopaths.....	3				3
Physicians and surgeons.....	189	23	37	18	267
Registered nurses.....	74				74
Surveyors.....	10	5	4	5	24
Theologians.....	20				20
Veterinarians.....	7	1	2	2	12
Total, professional services.....	679	56	92	40	867

CONTRACTING, No. 9

Contractors (general).....	504	18	39	15	576
Contractors (sub).....	42				42
Carpenters.....	67		3		70
Cesspool.....	27				27
Electrical.....	58	1	2	1	62
Engineering.....	6				6
Labor.....	4				4
Masons.....	85	1	4	1	91
Metal.....	10				10
Painting.....	235		13	7	255
Plastering and lathing.....	11				11
Plumbing.....	71	2	5		78
Repair and alterations.....	28	4			32
Roof and floor.....	12				12
Tile and marble.....	9				9
All other contracting.....	16	31	8	1	56
Total, contracting.....	1,185	57	74	25	1,341

AMUSEMENTS, ETC., No. 10

Amusements.....	326	26	19	13	384
Billiard parlors.....	139	29	64	14	246
Broadcasting.....	4				4
Dance halls.....	18				18
Entertainers.....					
Entertainments.....	64	12	2		78
Orchestra.....	41	11	16	12	80
Promoter.....	7				7
Sports, gymnasiums.....	11	1		3	15
Social entertainer.....	2				2
Theaters, shows.....	67	8	15	10	100
Total, amusements, etc.....	679	87	116	52	934

INTERESTS AND DISCOUNTS, No. 11

Finance and loan.....	31	11	5	3	50
Holding company.....					
Stock and bonds.....	4				4
Trust company.....	75	35	53		163
Other interest.....					
Total, interests and discounts.....	110	46	63	3	222

Number of persons (including corporations) engaged in various types of business as of December 1945, as shown by records of Bureau of Gross Income Taxes, Territorial Tax Office—Continued

COMMISSIONS, No. 12

Activity	First division, Oahu	Second division, Maui	Third division, Hawaii	Fourth division, Kauai	Territorial, all divisions
Building and loan	35			1	36
Business agents	22				22
Cashing check	1				1
Commissions	443	74	123	4	644
Insurance	323	24	38	23	408
Magazines (subscriptions)	61		7	6	74
Manufacturer's representative	132			7	139
Publisher's agent	7				7
Real estate	169	4	8	5	186
Trustees	24	1			25
Miscellaneous	47	6	6	3	62
Total, commissions	1,264	109	182	49	1,604

RENTALS, No. 13

Houses	8,870	638	259	291	10,058
Apartments	40			2	42
Auto rentals	39		8	4	51
Bicycle rentals	7				7
Hotels	82	11	22	2	117
Parking lots	25				25
Riding academy	11				11
Rooming houses	140		21	6	167
Miscellaneous	34	50	826	16	926
Total, rentals	9,248	699	1,136	321	11,404

ALL OTHER INCOME, No. 14

All other income, total	25	34	31		90
-------------------------	----	----	----	--	----

These tables show the number of persons (corporate or otherwise) engaged in each of the classifications of business shown. In many instances the same individual or corporation will appear under several classifications. Upon comparison of these tables with the preceding exhibit showing the number of gross-income licenses it will appear that the total number of persons engaged in business as shown by gross-income licenses issued by the tax commissioner is 36,875 as of December 1, 1945.

EXHIBIT 6C. PRESENTED BY THE HAWAII EQUAL RIGHTS COMMISSION

Dollar volume of business in various classifications as shown by gross income tax records, 1936-44

(Comparative statement of gross income and consumption taxes collected and the tax base for the calendar years, 1936 to 1944)

Tax rates	Classification of business activities	1936 taxes	Percent	1937 taxes	Percent	1938 taxes	Percent	1939 taxes	Percent
1 1/4 percent	Retailing	\$1,324,643.45	37.6	\$1,384,744.33	38.3	\$1,567,173.83	42.8	\$1,723,070.06	40.9
1 1/4 percent	Sugar processing	773,560.49	22.0	618,568.18	17.1	618,294.01	16.9	625,804.93	14.8
1 1/4 percent	Canning	460,444.43	13.1	577,034.13	16	327,256.42	9.0	518,603.44	12.3
1 1/4 percent	Producing	215,074.79	6.1	234,380.48	6.5	241,530.31	6.6	19,601.05	.5
1 1/4 percent	Wholesaling							187,734.01	4.4
1 1/4 percent	Manufacturing							39,044.41	.9
1 1/4 percent	Printing and publishing	28,992.37	.8	35,890.46	.1	36,236.77	1.0	26,020.74	.6
1 1/4 percent	Services	160,584.45	4.6	176,728.24	4.9	163,978.97	4.5	199,228.11	4.7
1 1/4 percent	Contracting	107,166.30	3	121,971.53	3.4	166,260.41	4.5	216,901.60	5.1
1 1/4 percent	Theater, amusement, radio	38,930.66	1.1	39,676.16	1.1	51,354.34	1.4	58,583.03	1.4
1 1/4 percent	Interest	37,505.50	1.0	34,709.84	1.0	39,253.20	1.0	48,521.72	1.2
1 1/4 percent	Commissions	75,774.22	2.2	75,708.72	2.0	83,896.07	2.3	99,932.79	2.4
1 1/4 percent	Rentals	172,731.40	4.9	170,602.63	4.7	205,529.39	5.6	237,689.10	5.6
1 1/4 percent	All others	42,629.82	1.2	43,356.55	1.2	49,402.63	1.3	88,674.09	2.1
1 1/4 percent	Consumption	86,335.70	2.4	102,251.67	2.8	114,281.05	3.1	129,214.33	3.1
1 1/4 percent	Penalties							3,049.08	
	Total tax	3,524,373.58	100.0	3,615,522.97	100.0	3,663,447.40	100.0	4,221,673.40	100.0
	License and register fees	26,165.00		24,450.00		24,893.00		26,190.00	

Tax rates	Classification of business activities	Tax base	Percent	Tax base	Percent	Tax base	Percent	Tax base	Percent
1 1/4 percent	Retailing	\$105,713,950.99	29.9	\$122,696,433.20	31.1	\$125,202,963.84	33.5	\$128,555,731.08	32.5
1 1/4 percent	Sugar processing	62,333,439.71	17.6	54,185,761.53	13.7	48,666,540.13	13.0	46,125,867.03	11.6
1 1/4 percent	Canning	36,835,629.12	10.4	49,254,162.81	12.5	26,180,517.43	7.0	37,331,018.00	9.4
1 1/4 percent	Producing	85,612,165.02	24.2	93,849,884.83	23.8	96,641,104.63	25.8	7,828,557.15	2.0
1 1/4 percent	Wholesaling							75,112,525.73	19.3
1 1/4 percent	Manufacturing							15,600,135.82	4.0
1 1/4 percent	Printing and publishing	2,906,370.68	.8	3,590,091.11	.9	3,625,853.44	1.0	2,459,924.46	.6
1 1/4 percent	Services	15,369,765.38	4.3	18,406,684.61	4.7	16,797,437.20	4.5	16,674,604.16	4.2
1 1/4 percent	Contracting	8,716,611.51	2.5	10,753,672.48	2.7	13,322,674.22	3.5	16,122,324.74	4.1
1 1/4 percent	Theater, amusement, radio	3,114,504.91	.9	3,513,519.21	.9	4,110,241.74	1.1	4,326,795.00	1.1
1 1/4 percent	Interest	2,993,966.51	.8	3,087,687.75	.8	3,086,980.59	.8	3,634,103.53	.9
1 1/4 percent	Commissions	6,069,056.18	1.7	6,709,391.07	1.7	6,800,762.55	1.8	7,428,416.81	1.9
1 1/4 percent	Rentals	13,806,858.40	3.9	15,186,980.27	3.9	16,425,542.85	4.4	17,636,526.92	4.5
1 1/4 percent	All others	3,405,048.66	1.0	3,756,298.11	1.0	3,932,537.88	1.1	6,499,059.77	1.6
1 1/4 percent	Consumption	6,886,131.44	2.0	9,099,750.25	2.3	9,162,982.55	2.5	9,471,263.44	2.3
	Total base	353,697,498.49	100.0	394,090,226.23	100.0	373,956,139.05	100.0	394,806,253.04	100.0

Tax rates	Classification of business activities	1940 taxes	Percent	1941 taxes	Percent	1942 taxes	Percent	1943 taxes	Percent	1944 taxes	Percent
1 1/4 percent	Retailing	\$2,171,926.36	42.6	\$2,853,845.42	42.8	\$3,832,233.05	41.2	\$5,003,503.27	48.1	\$5,404,948.01	52.6
1 1/4 percent	Sugar processing	692,121.06	13.6	790,311.55	11.8	776,354.30	8.4	973,210.01	9.4	865,429.07	8.4
1 1/4 percent	Canning	539,581.41	10.6	797,340.24	11.9	637,794.03	6.9	666,317.02	6.4	658,352.05	6.4
1 1/4 percent	Producing	20,603.18	.4	22,939.10	.3	23,371.59	.3	41,597.77	.4	44,748.29	.4
1 1/4 percent	Wholesaling	229,267.31	4.5	319,634.06	4.8	360,927.25	3.9	445,296.29	4.3	549,451.06	5.4
1 1/4 percent	Manufacturing	31,226.01	.6	58,777.68	.9	60,559.18	.6	61,676.06	.6	50,807.08	.5
1 1/4 percent	Printing and publishing	24,369.58	.5	49,519.05	.7	72,795.98	.8	58,074.35	.6	65,837.14	.6
1 1/4 percent	Services	308,493.40	6.0	384,445.99	5.8	502,323.07	5.4	621,161.56	6	706,510.50	6.9
1 1/4 percent	Contracting	275,138.07	5.4	370,994.85	5.6	1,985,017.01	21.3	1,282,864.22	12.3	624,512.77	6.1
1 1/4 percent	Theater, amusement, radio	75,576.62	1.5	106,584.72	1.6	110,910.84	1.2	184,652.64	1.8	241,466.60	2.4
1 1/4 percent	Interest	45,778.85	.9	53,301.21	.8	44,498.34	.5	39,499.45	.4	34,285.35	.3
1 1/4 percent	Commissions	117,689.72	2.3	143,097.79	2.1	142,346.12	1.5	182,770.27	1.7	221,142.76	2.2
1 1/4 percent	Rentals	306,864.74	6.0	367,489.23	5.5	428,121.19	4.6	491,181.35	4.7	492,922.64	4.8
1 1/4 percent	All others	120,511.45	2.3	127,333.67	1.9	166,324.24	1.8	199,329.94	1.9	183,423.10	1.8
1 1/4 percent	Consumption	143,967.42	2.8	233,599.98	3.5	154,727.97	1.6	141,917.70	1.4	129,883.79	1.2
	Penalties	4,700.10		2,583.10		2,225.66		2,470.79		2,751.82	
	Total tax	5,107,815.28	100.0	6,681,797.64	100.0	9,300,530.47	100.0	10,395,522.69	100.0	10,276,471.63	100.0
	License and register fees	23,063.00		29,929.00		30,082.00		33,303.00		34,772.00	

Tax rates	Classification of business activities	Tax base	Percent	Tax base	Percent	Tax base	Percent	Tax base	Percent	Tax base	Percent
1 1/4 percent	Retailing	\$144,794,945.88	33.3	\$190,256,170.98	32.8	\$255,491,987.83	33.3	\$333,566,551.08	38.1	\$386,426,010.61	40.8
1 1/4 percent	Sugar processing	46,141,356.51	10.6	52,687,384.14	9.1	51,756,901.57	6.7	64,880,602.43	7.4	62,418,063.31	6.6
1 1/4 percent	Canning	35,972,058.02	8.3	53,155,962.85	9.2	42,519,562.81	6.5	44,421,090.20	5.1	47,876,266.82	5.1
1 1/4 percent	Producing	8,241,272.00	1.9	9,175,640.00	1.6	9,348,636.00	1.2	16,639,108.00	1.9	17,899,316.00	1.9
1 1/4 percent	Wholesaling	91,706,924.00	21.2	127,853,624.00	22.1	144,370,900.00	18.8	178,118,616.00	20.3	219,780,424.00	23.2
1 1/4 percent	Manufacturing	12,490,404.00	2.8	23,511,072.00	4.0	24,223,672.00	3.2	24,670,424.00	2.8	20,322,832.00	2.1
1 1/4 percent	Printing and publication	1,624,637.02	.4	3,301,266.54	.6	4,853,080.47	.6	3,871,619.45	.4	4,740,518.20	.5
1 1/4 percent	Services	20,566,205.83	4.8	25,629,706.84	4.4	33,488,171.25	4.4	41,410,729.25	4.7	50,595,013.69	5.3
1 1/4 percent	Contracting	18,342,519.64	4.2	24,732,965.12	4.3	132,334,335.02	17.2	85,524,195.80	9.8	43,778,189.45	4.6
1 1/4 percent	Theater, amusement, radio	5,038,435.49	1.2	7,105,641.51	1.2	7,394,048.60	1.0	12,310,163.70	1.4	17,183,846.82	1.8
1 1/4 percent	Interest	3,051,920.28	.8	3,553,410.23	.6	2,966,553.05	.4	2,633,294.00	.3	2,462,790.89	.3
1 1/4 percent	Commissions	7,846,464.47	1.8	9,539,842.74	1.6	9,489,731.85	1.2	12,184,672.49	1.4	16,094,279.73	1.7
1 1/4 percent	Rentals	20,457,648.85	4.7	24,499,257.35	4.3	28,541,384.11	3.7	32,745,390.61	3.7	35,079,603.42	3.7
1 1/4 percent	All others	8,034,088.37	1.8	8,488,903.06	1.5	11,088,271.57	1.4	13,288,649.38	1.5	12,802,393.91	1.4
1 1/4 percent	Consumption	9,598,018.35	2.2	15,573,316.71	2.7	10,315,187.70	1.4	9,461,170.51	1.2	9,323,917.70	1.0
	Total base	433,906,898.71	100.0	579,064,164.07	100.0	768,172,403.83	100.0	875,726,176.90	100.0	946,783,466.55	100.0

NOTE.—The 1 1/4 percent rate has remained the same throughout the years; however, the basic 1 1/4 percent rate has been changed as follows: First 6 months of 1937, 1 percent; from July 1, 1939, to June 30, 1944, 1 1/4 percent; all other periods, 1 1/4 percent.

Exceptions.—The tax rate for professional services was 1/2 percent, and publishing and printing 1 percent from July 1, 1935, to June 30, 1939.

Office of the Tax Commissioner, Jan. 16, 1945.

EXHIBIT 6E. PRESENTED BY THE HAWAII EQUAL RIGHTS COMMISSION

*Sugar industry—Number of agencies and plantations*¹

Agency	Number of plantations represented	Approximate percentage of total sugar production
American Factors, Ltd.	9	30.8
C. Brewer & Co., Ltd.	14	23.5
Alexander & Baldwin	4	20.8
Castle & Cooke, Ltd.	3	14.5
Theo. H. Davies, Ltd.	4	6.9
Bishop Trust Co., Ltd.	1	.9
F. A. Shaefer & Co., Ltd.	1	2.6
Total	36	100.0

¹ See exhibit 11g for further information.

Source: Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association.

EXHIBIT 6F. PRESENTED BY THE HAWAII EQUAL RIGHTS COMMISSION

Bank Deposits, 1901 to 1945

Fiscal year—	Number of banks	Demand deposits, Dec. 31	Time deposits, June 30	Total
1901	8	\$3,857,413.16	\$804,718.01	\$4,662,131.17
1902	9	4,094,919.90	1,073,581.56	5,168,501.46
1903	9	3,694,963.00	1,102,707.24	4,797,672.24
1904	9	4,159,078.89	1,372,157.00	5,531,235.89
1905	9	3,993,052.90	1,695,326.76	5,688,379.66
1906	9	5,022,495.26	2,527,943.96	7,550,439.22
1907	11	4,966,042.04	2,777,554.40	7,743,596.44
1908	11	5,074,836.16	2,588,722.87	7,663,559.03
1909	11	6,334,991.42	3,322,827.79	9,657,819.21
1910	11	9,033,385.97	4,280,919.57	13,324,305.54
1911	16	10,289,707.89	5,020,555.62	15,310,263.51
1912	17	12,667,162.39	5,521,973.11	18,189,135.50
1913	17	11,641,901.30	5,384,395.72	17,026,297.02
1914	18	10,371,874.60	6,275,790.63	16,647,665.23
1915	19	12,378,041.53	7,736,569.32	20,114,610.85
1916	19	17,317,339.40	9,061,910.28	26,379,249.68
1917	22	22,486,524.31	10,205,496.70	32,692,021.01
1918	23	24,620,004.80	9,892,708.08	34,512,712.88
1919	26	24,898,287.81	10,450,846.55	35,349,134.36
1920	26	36,975,335.93	15,807,778.11	52,783,114.04
1921	31	32,545,538.38	18,635,866.41	51,181,404.79
1922	28	28,379,489.19	17,863,992.17	46,243,481.36
1923	29	31,616,007.38	21,765,731.51	53,381,738.90
1924	29	33,257,399.35	23,238,363.06	56,495,762.41
1925	29	39,101,344.22	21,708,371.75	60,809,715.97
1926	29	44,861,828.81	22,989,564.24	67,851,393.05
1927	29	47,922,072.59	27,102,219.88	75,024,292.47
1928	31	48,931,629.35	31,278,434.34	80,210,063.69
1929	31	43,614,424.66	35,424,494.59	79,038,919.25
1930	29	46,232,391.03	33,942,357.47	80,174,748.50
1931	29	42,217,616.83	41,587,979.74	83,805,596.57
1932	31	38,653,331.79	35,030,829.73	73,684,161.52
1933	31	38,303,127.06	36,032,334.45	74,335,461.51
1934	30	40,889,840.08	35,082,104.56	75,951,944.64
1935	31	46,743,557.25	37,159,777.16	83,903,334.41
1936	31	39,920,831.84	54,987,012.48	94,907,844.32
1937	31	44,758,938.65	58,441,637.73	103,200,576.38
1938	28	47,559,209.98	60,891,450.05	108,450,660.03
1939	28	49,190,621.64	62,170,770.68	111,361,392.32
1940	28	55,409,184.94	67,887,082.80	123,296,267.74
1941	37	76,961,343.34	75,800,296.13	152,761,639.47
1942	37	127,337,568.80	72,688,941.74	200,026,510.24
1943	38	192,269,322.27	117,607,370.87	309,876,693.14
1944	43	243,015,961.93	159,393,538.04	402,409,499.97
1945	44	280,979,760.37	212,316,180.39	493,295,940.76

*Consolidated Statement of Condition of Banks and Trust Companies
Operating in the Territory of Hawaii at the close of business June 30, 1945*

EXHIBIT 6G. PRESENTED BY THE HAWAII EQUAL RIGHTS COMMISSION

	4 banks operating 38 branches	5 trust companies	Total, June 30, 1945
Assets:			
Loans, discounts and advances.....	\$37,263,514.22	\$8,694,783.07	\$45,958,297.29
Overdrafts.....	53,195.94		53,195.94
U. S. Government obligations.....	358,978,830.66	2,434,003.30	361,412,833.86
All other securities.....	17,657,213.80	1,502,218.86	19,159,432.66
Premises, furniture and fixtures.....	3,222,344.66	692,460.80	3,914,805.46
Other real estate owned.....	11,526.97	472,549.63	484,076.60
Other assets.....	891,994.25	62,664.93	954,659.18
Cash and due from banks, cash items and clearings.....	94,070,499.30	6,243,988.59	100,314,467.89
Total assets.....	512,149,119.70	20,102,669.18	532,251,788.88
Liabilities and capital:			
Deposits:			
Demand.....	148,012,884.05		148,012,884.05
Time.....	210,011,130.77		210,011,130.77
Government.....	126,705,939.19		126,705,939.19
All other.....	8,565,986.75		8,565,986.75
Total deposits.....	493,295,940.76		493,295,940.76
Trust and agency credit balances.....		11,203,465.22	11,203,465.22
Bills payable.....			
Other liabilities.....	921,306.91	573,401.28	1,494,708.19
Total liabilities.....	494,217,247.67	11,776,866.50	505,994,114.17
Capital:			
Paid-in.....	6,050,000.00	3,439,730.00	9,489,730.00
Surplus.....	5,400,000.00	2,753,401.30	8,153,401.30
Undivided profits.....	1,539,213.72	1,447,317.58	2,986,531.30
Reserves.....	4,942,658.31	685,353.80	5,628,012.11
Total capital.....	17,931,872.03	8,325,802.68	26,257,674.71
Total liabilities and capital.....	512,149,119.70	20,102,669.18	532,251,788.88

From office of the bank examiner, Territory of Hawaii.

EXHIBIT 6H. PRESENTED BY THE HAWAII EQUAL RIGHTS COMMISSION

Comparative consolidated statement of condition of 9 building and loan associations¹ operating in the Territory of Hawaii as at the close of business June 30, 1945, Dec. 31, 1944, and June 30, 1944

	June 30, 1945	Dec. 31, 1944	June 30, 1944	Increase or decrease during last—	
				6 months	12 months
ASSETS					
Mortgage loans.....	\$12,052,959.91	\$11,264,956.06	\$10,612,100.25	\$788,003.85	\$1,440,859.66
Share loans.....	70,231.27	46,448.80	59,833.21	23,782.47	10,398.06
Real estate sold on contract.....	55,358.41	71,364.30	104,047.96	² 16,005.89	² 48,689.55
Real estate owned.....	0	4,000.00	8,000.00	² 4,000.00	² 8,000.00
U. S. Government obligations.....	6,748,950.00	5,814,500.00	4,979,500.00	934,450.00	1,769,450.00
All other securities.....	79,500.00	67,400.00	67,400.00	12,100.00	12,100.00
Premises, furniture and fixtures.....	363,886.54	362,489.45	89,073.83	1,397.09	274,812.71
Other assets.....	89,768.60	85,805.07	91,112.92	3,963.53	1,344.32
Cash on hand and in banks.....	1,272,495.99	1,311,217.97	1,059,557.20	² 38,721.98	212,938.79
Total assets.....	20,733,150.72	19,028,181.65	17,070,625.37	1,704,969.07	3,662,525.35
LIABILITIES					
Guaranty stock.....	78,038.25	76,989.69	76,989.69	1,048.56	1,048.56
Withdrawable shares.....	19,021,940.97	17,445,127.92	15,482,477.01	1,576,813.05	3,539,463.96
Investment certificates.....	0	0	0	0	0
Bills payable.....	0	28,000.00	10,000.00	² 28,000.00	² 10,000.00
Loans in process.....	416,827.70	426,158.85	507,863.09	² 9,331.15	² 91,035.39
Other liabilities.....	45,936.79	38,118.31	44,316.65	7,818.48	1,620.14
Reserves.....	847,988.74	736,573.53	663,757.76	111,415.21	184,230.98
Surplus and undivided profits.....	322,418.27	277,213.35	285,221.17	45,204.92	37,197.10
Total liabilities.....	20,733,150.72	19,028,181.65	17,070,625.37	1,704,969.07	3,662,525.35

¹ Includes 1 Federal association.

² Decrease.

Source: Office of the bank examiner, Territory of Hawaii.

EXHIBIT 6I. PRESENTED BY THE HAWAII EQUAL RIGHTS COMMISSION

Comparative consolidated statement of condition of licensees under the Industrial Loan Act in the Territory of Hawaii June 30, 1945, Dec. 31, 1944, and June 30, 1944

	June 30, 1945	Dec. 31, 1944	June 30, 1944
ASSETS			
Real-estate mortgage loans.....	\$883,584.66	\$921,659.12	\$822,558.46
Retail installment contracts.....	27,513.73	29,530.30	75,881.57
Character loans.....	717,237.56	687,414.17	755,946.76
Collateral loans.....	792,498.78	671,719.79	670,599.51
Automobile and trade financing loans.....	388,215.01	446,275.96	390,473.39
All other loans.....	174,740.10	245,629.00	248,869.61
Total loans.....	2,983,789.84	3,012,218.34	2,934,328.30
Judgments and repossessions.....		784.35	1,689.04
Furniture and fixtures.....	19,017.31	20,256.62	22,074.07
Cash on hand and in banks.....	486,794.50	457,856.33	460,113.09
All other assets.....	556,657.60	641,061.74	588,426.55
Total assets.....	4,070,259.25	4,132,177.38	4,006,636.05
LIABILITIES			
Bills payable.....	707,633.08	808,914.67	726,857.14
Other liabilities.....	232,345.04	229,261.89	235,737.17
Unearned discount.....	143,634.00	127,456.37	124,816.65
Capital stock paid in.....	2,428,224.62	2,461,324.07	2,379,148.35
Surplus and undivided profits.....	371,932.84	322,657.44	357,491.45
Reserves.....	186,489.77	182,562.94	182,585.29
Total liabilities.....	4,070,259.25	4,132,177.38	4,006,636.05
Number of licensees.....	25	24	26

Source: Office of the bank examiner, Territory of Hawaii.

EXHIBIT 6J. PRESENTED BY THE HAWAII EQUAL RIGHTS COMMISSION

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII

COMPARISON OF THE OPERATIONS OF PUBLIC UTILITIES IN TERRITORY OF HAWAII FOR YEAR 1941 WITH YEAR 1944

(See exhibit 55 for railroad statistics)

Introductory.—The text of this report has been prepared in a manner that will permit a comparison of the operations of the various utility enterprises in the Territory for the prewar year 1941 with the year 1944.

This comparison will show in some degree the increased demands which the utilities have been required to meet and will indicate that in practically every case the operating facilities have been utilized to their limit.

General.—The following tabulation shows that total gross revenues received by the 30 operating utilities included in the various classifications have increased \$13,619,751.64 in 1944 over the year 1941, a percentage increase of 58.1 percent. The largest increases, it is to be seen, have been experienced by the transportation companies.

	1944	1941	Increase	Percent
Electric.....	\$10,528,995.29	\$7,520,558.53	\$3,008,436.76	40.0
Gas.....	2,160,385.96	1,793,498.66	366,887.30	20.4
Telephone.....	3,944,960.23	2,639,158.91	1,105,801.32	38.9
Steam railroad.....	7,344,294.61	3,991,319.04	3,352,975.57	84.0
Honolulu Rapid Transit Co., Ltd.....	6,423,633.75	2,199,285.12	4,224,348.63	192.0
Interurban Transportation.....	1,565,079.95	421,981.75	1,143,098.20	270.9
Inter-Island Steam Navigation Co., Ltd.....	3,250,201.28	3,751,280.79	501,079.51	13.4
Hawaiian Airlines, Ltd.....	1,734,937.35	749,482.69	985,454.66	131.5
Miscellaneous.....	111,059.15	177,230.44	66,171.29	37.3
Total.....	37,063,547.57	23,443,795.93	13,619,751.64	58.1

The average annual domestic consumption of electricity on the Island of Oahu for the year 1944 was 1,647 kilowatt-hours. The comparable figure for the year 1941 was 1,411 kilowatt-hours; therefore, the increase over the period was 236 kilowatt-hours, or 16.7 percent. Total electric consumers for the Territory increased from 80,080 in 1941 to 82,194 in 1944, a percentage increase of only 2.6. This does not, however, include the very substantial number of Army and Navy installations that have been added to the systems and included in most of the reports as one or two consumers only. The relative increase from this source of business is clearly indicated in the tabulation below, showing the energy delivered to consumers and the system peak demand for the Hawaiian Electric Co., Ltd., serving the island of Oahu.

Telephone subscribers during the 3-year period increased from 45,501 to 55,271, or 21.47 percent. New installations were made only on high priorities as defined by the War Production Board and each island system had a substantial list of unfilled applications for telephones. Approximately 3,500 such applications were on file in the Honolulu office at December 31, 1944.

The net increase in the plant accounts of the electric, gas, and telephone utilities during the 3-year period totaled \$3,037,620.47, or 25 percent. In addition to this increase of plant in service there is some \$702,000 of plant under construction at December 31, 1944.

The utilities' part in the war.—The increased demands upon the facilities of the utilities, particularly those larger companies serving the island of Oahu, are illustrated in the following tabulation:

	1944	1941	Percent increase
Hawaiian Electric Co., Ltd.:			
Energy delivered to consumers, kilowatt-hours.....	476, 773. 373	293, 605. 108	62. 39
System peak demand, kilowatt-hours.....	103, 400	78, 800	31. 22
Honolulu Gas Co., Ltd.:			
Gas delivered to consumers, cubic feet.....	1, 811, 925, 300	1, 097, 077, 800	65. 16
24-hour peak.....	6, 768, 000	4, 642, 358	45. 79
Mutual Telephone Co.:			
Local exchange calls.....	11, 179, 290	8, 635, 831	29. 45
Originating toll calls.....	346, 627	217, 448	59. 41
Honolulu Rapid Transit Co., Ltd.: Total passengers carried.....	124, 796, 804	38, 460, 781	224. 48

The Honolulu Rapid Transit Co., Ltd., has faced extremely heavy demands upon its services as is evidenced by the increase of passengers carried of approximately 224.5 percent over the 3-year period. The increase of automotive equipment during the same period has not been proportional due to the inability of the manufacturers to make deliveries and to the lack of shipping space.

At dates of December 31, 1944, and December 31, 1941, the company owned and/or operated the following passenger-carrying vehicles.

	1944	1941	Percent increase
Gasoline busses.....	197	125	58
Electric trolley coaches.....	90	90	—
Diesel busses.....	29	—	100
Total.....	316	215	47

The total of 316 units at December 31, 1944, has now been increased by 25 electric trolley coaches and 14 gasoline busses. There are 36 additional gasoline busses to be delivered which will then make a total of 391 units, an increase of 82 percent over the 1941 total. The estimated cost of these 75 units is \$1,050,000.

New capital.—A substantial amount of new capital has been authorized by the commission during the years 1942–44. The constantly increasing demands during that period for utility services of all types has evidently not yet abated. In addition to the new capital authorized, as listed below, the commission during 1945 to date has approved the issuance of \$200,000 in bonds and \$3,000,000 of preferred stock.

	Bank loans	Bonds	Preferred stock	Common stock
Honolulu Rapid Transit Co., Ltd.			\$750,000	
Mutual Telephone Co.		\$1,000,000		\$1,000,000
Kauai Electric Co., Ltd.				25,000
Kapaa Electric Co., Ltd.				20,000
Honolulu Gas Co., Ltd.	\$1,200,000			
Wahiawa Transport Service, Ltd.	67,500		10,000	15,000
Hawaiian Electric Co., Ltd.		5,000,000		
Total	1,267,500	6,000,000	760,000	1,060,000

A refinancing program has also been adopted during the period and some \$5,800,000 of 3½-percent bonds have been issued for an equal principal amount of 4-percent bonds.

Statistics.—Appended hereto is a table showing the average cost or value of each company's utility property for the year 1944. These values have been determined by methods explained in the accompanying footnotes. There is also shown the utility operating net income and the rate of return earned on the stated average cost or value of the property.

The following table is presented to give a maximum of information on public utilities and public utility regulation in a minimum of space.

	Island	Average "value" year 1944	Utility operating net income year 1944	
			Amount	Percent of value
Electric utilities:				
The Hawaiian Electric Co., Ltd. ¹ -----	Oahu-----	\$21,719,620	\$1,128,016	5.19
Hilo Electric Light Co., Ltd. ¹ -----	Hawaii-----	2,306,839	129,378	5.61
Kona Light & Power Co., Ltd. ¹ -----	do-----	109,406	14,270	13.04
Kohala Ditch Co., Ltd. (electric department). ² -----	do-----	55,411	2,345	4.23
Maui Electric Co., Ltd. ¹ -----	Maui-----	572,416	43,659	7.63
Kaekuku Sugar Co., Ltd. (electric department). ¹ -----	do-----	12,408	6,118	49.31
Lahaina Ice Co., Ltd. ¹ -----	do-----	39,851	1,262	3.17
Molokai Electric Co., Ltd. ² -----	Molokai-----	171,889	10,082	5.87
Kapaa Electric Co., Ltd. ¹ -----	Kauai-----	94,750	5,368	5.67
Kauai Electric Co., Ltd. ¹ -----	do-----	111,114	18,618	16.76
Waiahi Electric Co., Ltd. ¹ -----	do-----	28,650	8,361	29.18
Waimea Electric Co., Ltd. ¹ -----	do-----	49,731	814	1.64
Gas utilities:				
Honolulu Gas Co., Ltd. ¹ -----	Oahu-----	4,184,171	213,478	5.10
Hilo Gas Co., Ltd. ¹ -----	Hawaii-----	225,848	14,440	6.39
Telephone utilities: Mutual Telephone Co. ⁴ -----	Territory-----	10,262,611	443,680	4.32
Subtotal-----		39,944,715	2,027,653	5.08
Water utilities: Kohala Ditch Co., Ltd. (water department).²				
Street railways: Honolulu Rapid Transit Co., Ltd. ^{1,2} -----	Hawaii-----	305,253	13,157	4.31
Motor vehicle common carriers: All. ² -----	Oahu-----	3,463,275	398,679	11.51
Steam railroads:-----	do-----	356,777	88,927	24.92
Oahu Railway & Land Co. ² -----	do-----	6,095,294	538,800	8.84
Hawaii Consolidated Ry., Ltd. ² -----	Hawaii-----	4,952,517	150,551	3.04
Kahului Railroad Co. ² -----	Maui-----	1,454,561	260,041	17.88
Steamship companies: Inter-Island Steam Navigation Co., Ltd. ² -----	Territory-----	6,602,691	409,711	6.21
Airways companies: Hawaiian Airlines, Ltd. ² -----	do-----	668,367	74,959	11.22
Miscellaneous utilities: Mahukona Terminals, Ltd. ² -----	Hawaii-----	139,063	20,546	14.77
Total-----		63,982,513	3,395,536	5.31

¹ Rate bases previously established by public utilities commission and projected to Dec. 31, 1944, by changes shown in companies' books and accounts.

² Net book cost of utility plant accounts, including materials and supplies and cash working capital where considered warranted.

³ Historical cost rate base computed by commission's staff. Formal hearings on this case have not been completed.

⁴ Tentative rate base determined on an investment basis as per the company's books and accounts.

⁵ This company's investment is subject to an increase of approximately \$1,050,000 for new equipment now being received.

⁶ This amount represents the rate base determined by the U. S. Maritime Commission as of June 30, 1938, and projected to December 31, 1944, by the public utilities commission staff.

EXHIBIT 7A. PRESENTED BY THE HAWAII EQUAL RIGHTS COMMISSION

*Hawaiian sugar-production record*¹

[In tons of 2,000 pounds]

Year	Tons	Year	Tons	Year	Tons
1837	2	1873	11,565	1909	535,156
1838	44	1874	12,283	1910	518,127
1839	50	1875	12,540	1911	566,821
1840	180	1876	13,036	1912	595,258
1841	30	1877	12,788	1913	546,798
1842	572	1878	19,215	1914	617,038
1843		1879	24,510	1915	646,445
1844	257	1880	31,792	1916	593,483
1845	161	1881	46,895	1917	644,574
1846	150	1882	57,088	1918	576,842
1847	297	1883	57,053	1919	603,583
1848	260	1884	71,327	1920	556,871
1849	327	1885	85,695	1921	539,196
1850	375	1886	108,112	1922	609,077
1851	11	1887	106,362	1923	545,606
1852	350	1888	117,944	1924	701,433
1853	321	1889	121,083	1925	776,072
1854	288	1890	129,899	1926	787,246
1855	145	1891	137,492	1927	811,333
1856	277	1892	131,308	1928	904,040
1857	350	1893	165,411	1929	913,670
1858	602	1894	153,342	1930	924,463
1859	913	1895	147,627	1931	993,787
1860	572	1896	221,828	1932	1,025,354
1861	1,281	1897	251,126	1933	1,035,548
1862	1,503	1898	229,414	1934	952,187
1863	2,646	1899	282,807	1935	963,316
1864	5,207	1900	289,544	1936	1,016,371
1865	7,659	1901	360,038	1937	920,628
1866	8,865	1902	355,611	1938	917,979
1867	8,564	1903	457,691	1939	968,393
1868	9,106	1904	367,475	1940	951,411
1869	9,151	1905	426,428	1941	922,272
1870	9,392	1906	429,213	1942	846,379
1871	10,880	1907	440,017	1943	885,640
1872	8,498*	1908	521,123	1944	874,946

¹ See also the following relating to the sugar industry: Production—exhibit 30a, and exhibits 7b and 7c, which follow. Agencies—exhibit 6c. Labor—exhibits 11g, 30b, 93, and 94. Stock holdings—exhibit 11g.

Source: Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association.

EXHIBIT 7B. PRESENTED BY THE HAWAII EQUAL RIGHTS COMMISSION

Hawaiian sugar production, by acreage and value, from 1915 to 1944

Year	Total acres in cane	Approximate value	Year	Total acres in cane	Approximate value
1915	239,800	\$59,964,238	1930	242,761	\$62,401,252
1916	246,332	68,523,548	1931	251,533	66,166,328
1917	245,100	79,527,540	1932	251,876	60,003,716
1918	276,800	69,567,145	1933	254,563	66,482,181
1919	239,900	87,881,684	1934	252,237	65,495,134
1920	247,900	146,100,675	1935	246,491	62,076,082
1921	236,500	51,536,353	1936	245,891	73,138,057
1922	229,000	56,351,804	1937	240,833	63,541,744
1923	235,000	76,624,906	1938	238,302	53,848,882
1924	232,000	83,638,870	1939	235,227	57,774,266
1925	241,000	67,223,556	1940	235,110	52,984,078
1926	237,774	68,254,228	1941	238,111	64,210,010
1927	234,809	76,622,288	1942	225,199	65,039,900
1928	240,769	76,156,329	1943	220,928	66,245,872
1929	239,858	68,726,257	1944	216,072	65,498,532

Source: Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association.

EXHIBIT 7C. PRESENTED BY THE HAWAII EQUAL RIGHTS COMMISSION

United States sugar consumption and principal sources of sugar consumed, calendar years 1898-1944, inclusive, refined and/or consumption value tons of 2,000 pounds

Year	Total consumption, tons	Per capita, pounds	Louisiana, including Texas and Florida		Beets		Hawaii	
			Tons	Percent	Tons	Percent	Tons	Percent
1898	2,243,250	61.5	283,150	12.6	38,587	1.7		
1899	2,327,436	62.6	179,648	7.7	70,365	3.0		
1900	2,486,229	65.2	195,384	7.8	92,664	3.7		
1901	2,656,994	68.7	327,208	12.3	139,482	5.2	346,168	13.0
1902	2,874,041	72.8	331,520	11.5	166,349	5.8	348,476	12.1
1903	2,855,600	70.9	327,936	11.6	277,271	9.7	400,792	14.0
1904	3,099,221	75.3	362,457	11.7	190,551	6.1	370,432	11.9
1905	2,948,082	70.5	374,665	12.7	247,209	8.4	421,677	14.3
1906	3,207,694	76.10	300,101	9.4	336,355	10.5	385,120	12.0
1907	3,353,256	77.54	296,765	8.9	420,459	12.5	468,274	13.9
1908	3,568,084	81.17	437,795	12.3	552,384	15.5	507,840	14.2
1909	3,648,580	81.80	459,155	12.6	486,080	13.3	541,712	14.8
1910	3,752,398	81.60	372,967	9.2	511,480	13.6	574,223	13.7
1911	3,753,558	79.20	322,643	8.6	567,644	15.1	540,099	14.4
1912	3,924,684	81.30	288,057	7.3	578,873	14.7	589,435	15.0
1913	4,192,316	85.40	232,633	5.5	700,352	16.7	567,342	13.5
1914	4,212,126	84.29	161,276	3.8	699,214	16.6	571,631	13.6
1915	4,257,715	83.83	251,740	5.9	861,568	20.2	570,375	13.4
1916	4,097,640	79.34	251,975	6.1	784,287	19.1	598,045	14.6
1917	4,125,631	78.58	269,456	7.0	879,288	21.3	663,139	16.1
1918	3,915,079	73.36	253,428	6.5	591,029	15.1	481,344	12.3
1919	4,555,792	85.43	172,518	3.8	976,924	21.4	576,003	12.6
1920	4,714,633	86.56	84,433	1.8	508,980	11.1	437,418	9.6
1921	4,600,207	84.47	305,406	6.6	1,060,614	23.1	540,201	11.7
1922	5,703,889	103.18	305,723	5.4	1,005,344	17.6	516,669	9.1
1923	5,354,366	95.63	241,475	4.5	985,519	18.4	515,031	9.6
1924	5,437,016	95.90	91,446	1.7	834,030	15.3	566,684	10.4
1925	6,171,267	107.50	139,948	2.3	993,803	16.1	712,854	11.5
1926	6,351,895	109.30	78,690	1.2	977,553	15.4	692,270	10.9
1927	5,932,696	100.95	43,229	.7	874,005	14.7	712,057	12.0
1928	6,207,752	104.27	129,639	2.1	1,161,710	18.7	765,505	12.3
1929	6,508,298	108.13	176,482	2.7	959,437	14.7	867,932	13.3
1930	6,271,302	99.37	184,439	2.9	1,066,050	17.0	753,136	12.0
1931	6,132,228	98.47	192,411	3.1	1,255,816	20.5	903,746	14.7
1932	5,839,636	93.29	149,763	2.6	1,232,156	21.1	956,868	16.4
1933	5,902,810	93.60	294,147	5.0	1,276,615	21.6	924,841	15.7
1934	5,750,915	90.71	238,274	4.1	1,444,146	25.1	831,139	14.5
1935	5,980,696	93.78	290,027	4.8	1,321,993	22.1	925,273	15.5
1936	6,184,093	96.29	417,871	6.8	1,366,166	22.1	862,735	14.0
1937	5,690,583	98.30	414,212	7.28	1,034,918	18.18	816,303	14.34
1938	5,604,051	96.11	459,382	8.20	1,179,009	21.04	741,996	13.24
1939	5,648,513	96.20	517,981	9.17	1,391,972	24.64	743,426	13.16
1940	5,712,587	96.62	349,350	6.12	1,428,065	24.99	807,393	14.13
1941	6,567,921	111.32	323,611	4.93	1,562,694	23.79	744,407	11.33
1942	4,736,913	76.88	377,692	7.97	1,481,073	31.27	630,056	13.30
1943	5,263,624	85.81	391,645	7.44	1,294,881	24.60	649,728	12.34
1944	5,725,249	92.37	421,234	7.36	968,186	16.91	584,277	10.20

Year	Puerto Rico		Philippines		Cuba	
	Tons	Percent	Tons	Percent	Tons	Percent
1898						
1899						
1900	(1)		(1)			
1901	74,233	2.8	5,712	0.2		
1902	95,006	3.3	2,856	.1		
1903	96,307	3.4	33,541	1.2	(2)	
1904	130,975	4.2	24,752	.8	1,266,214	40.8
1905	139,919	4.7	16,434	.6	1,233,804	41.9
1906	217,265	6.8	46,928	1.5	1,305,913	40.7
1907	238,395	7.1	11,985	.4	1,501,248	44.8
1908	207,295	5.8	50,500	1.4	1,026,751	28.8

¹ The Territory of Hawaii and the possessions of Puerto Rico and the Philippine Islands were not shown separately until 1901.

² Cuba was not shown separately until 1904.

Source: Department of Agriculture.

United States sugar consumption and principal sources of sugar consumed, calendar years 1898-1944, inclusive, refined and/or consumption value tons of 2,000 pounds—Continued

Year	Puerto Rico		Philippines		Cuba	
	Tons	Percent	Tons	Percent	Tons	Percent
1909.....	263,331	7.2	52,421	1.4	1,598,835	43.8
1910.....	310,033	8.3	108,257	2.9	1,837,004	48.9
1911.....	314,297	8.4	188,617	5.0	1,578,370	42.6
1912.....	319,823	8.1	147,704	3.8	1,864,646	47.5
1913.....	370,835	8.8	49,974	1.2	2,229,731	53.2
1914.....	307,047	7.3	135,393	3.2	2,261,116	53.7
1915.....	336,347	7.9	134,626	3.2	2,062,594	48.4
1916.....	439,861	10.7	124,424	3.0	1,866,534	45.6
1917.....	482,946	11.7	81,580	1.9	1,687,701	40.9
1918.....	371,307	9.5	52,177	1.3	2,106,993	53.8
1919.....	321,306	7.1	81,212	1.8	2,315,097	50.8
1920.....	375,128	8.2	127,734	2.8	2,389,743	52.2
1921.....	418,613	9.1	146,908	3.2	2,090,091	45.4
1922.....	348,512	6.1	240,183	4.2	3,237,440	56.8
1923.....	281,363	5.3	221,677	4.1	2,966,009	55.4
1924.....	362,834	7.0	297,241	5.5	3,163,054	68.2
1925.....	564,070	9.1	453,461	7.3	3,258,129	62.8
1926.....	514,846	8.1	350,250	5.5	3,656,252	58.0
1927.....	540,365	9.1	486,687	8.2	3,262,446	55.0
1928.....	652,889	10.5	533,199	8.6	2,920,410	47.0
1929.....	430,013	6.6	677,041	10.4	3,376,345	51.9
1930.....	728,992	11.6	751,852	12.0	2,752,745	43.9
1931.....	699,363	11.4	761,564	12.4	2,280,563	37.2
1932.....	851,103	14.6	973,693	16.7	1,647,243	28.2
1933.....	739,245	12.5	1,160,027	19.7	1,495,992	25.3
1934.....	787,112	13.6	1,036,123	18.0	1,415,064	24.6
1935.....	763,894	12.8	839,050	14.0	1,836,184	30.7
1936.....	817,772	13.2	868,241	14.6	1,840,149	29.8
1937.....	763,500	13.42	813,303	14.29	1,801,415	31.66
1938.....	719,732	12.84	806,014	14.38	1,632,690	29.13
1939.....	788,175	13.95	793,558	14.05	1,402,886	24.84
1940.....	722,677	12.65	808,343	14.15	1,593,547	27.90
1941.....	779,650	11.87	699,102	10.65	2,369,823	36.08
1942.....	697,527	14.72	19,273	.41	1,529,031	32.29
1943.....	508,656	9.66	-----	-----	2,415,845	45.90
1944.....	596,841	10.42	-----	-----	3,140,213	54.85

EXHIBIT 8A. PRESENTED BY THE HAWAII EQUAL RIGHTS COMMISSION

The pineapple pack of Hawaii¹

Year	Total cases	Approximate value	Year	Total cases	Approximate value
1922.....	4,770,239	\$19,557,980	1930.....	12,672,296	\$50,055,569
1923.....	5,895,747	28,004,798	1931.....	12,807,919	34,997,300
1924.....	6,325,904	30,033,978	1932.....	5,063,793	9,570,568
1925.....	8,728,580	30,550,030	1933.....	7,815,540	23,000,000
1926.....	8,938,590	34,417,422	1935.....	14,467,322	28,629,711
1927.....	8,879,252	33,297,195	1940.....	22,341,429	45,851,706
1928.....	8,665,056	35,352,766	1945.....	18,113,000	-----
1929.....	9,211,376	38,227,210			

¹ See also the following relating to the pineapple industry:

Production—Exhibit 8b, which follows.
Plantations and canneries—Exhibit 11h.
Labor—Exhibits 11h and 79a-b.

Source: Pineapple Growers' Association.

EXHIBIT 8b. PRESENTED BY THE HAWAII EQUAL RIGHTS COMMISSION

*Shipments, canned pineapple from Hawaii to the mainland, United States, calendar years 1927-45, and canned juice for calendar years 1934-45*¹

Year	Quantity, pineapple	Quantity, juice	Quantity, total	Value, pineapple	Value, juice	Value, total
	<i>Pounds</i>	<i>Pounds</i>	<i>Pounds</i>	<i>Pounds</i>	<i>Pounds</i>	<i>Pounds</i>
1927	408,161,279			\$33,501,587		
1928	495,686,248			39,298,591		
1929	439,866,903			38,430,805		
1930	423,170,468			37,727,761		
1931	494,275,079			35,341,062		
1932	388,068,857			20,591,503		
1933	434,884,057			23,925,003		
1934	540,935,612	2,035,477	542,971,089	34,156,106	\$115,975	\$34,272,081
1935	436,800,865	103,529,320	540,330,185	28,239,449	5,647,112	33,886,561
1936	571,947,430	233,029,335	804,976,768	35,835,794	12,612,689	51,448,483
1937	595,790,000	283,849,733	879,639,733	42,705,000	16,749,976	59,454,976
1938	373,516,447	220,801,559	594,318,006	24,632,467	13,216,993	37,849,460
1939	536,327,235	311,676,574	848,003,809	34,098,779	16,723,754	50,822,533
1940	434,426,037	351,847,499	786,273,536	27,829,668	17,843,367	45,673,035
1941	648,525,912	396,505,682	1,045,031,594	42,051,697	21,255,675	63,307,372
1942	328,488,569	221,960,254	550,448,823	25,014,144	13,967,632	38,981,776
1943	248,848,467	209,571,542	458,420,009	24,351,548	15,554,330	39,905,878
1944	190,891,049	102,330,000	293,221,949	18,728,401	7,297,292	26,025,693
1945	143,762,433	162,133,331	305,895,764	14,369,453	12,566,041	26,935,494

(Information from Monthly Summary, U. S. Department of Commerce, Washington.)

¹ It will be noted that the amounts of both canned pineapple and juice was affected during the war years by the amount shipped to the armed forces.

Source: Pineapple Growers' Association.

EXHIBIT 9a. PRESENTED BY THE HAWAII EQUAL RIGHTS COMMISSION

AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS SECTION

DECEMBER 1945.

Agricultural Extension Service, University of Hawaii; U. S. Department of Agriculture cooperating, H. H. Warner, Director. Acts of Congress of May 8 and June 30, 1914.

STATISTICAL REPORT OF DIVERSIFIED AGRICULTURE IN HAWAII

Prepared for 1946 statehood hearing

TABLE I.—Total acreage by counties (1940 census)

	Land area (acres)	Percent in farms
Hawaii County	2,573,440	59.0
Maui and Kalawao County	50,720	69.7
Kauai Counties	398,720	64.0
City and county of Honolulu	376,960	50.1
Total	4,099,840	60.6

TABLE II.—Utilization of land area¹

	<i>Acres</i>
Forest reserves: Private and Government (1945)	1,063,710
Parks: Federal, city, and county	165,000
Army and Navy camp sites	75,000
Wastelands: Cities, towns, roads, and highways	1,150,450
Pasture land: Public and private (1938)	1,313,500
Homesteads (1938)	22,870
Land used for crops (1940)	309,310
Total (1940 census)	4,099,840

¹ Based on first progress report, Territorial Planning Board. For figures as of Dec. 31, 1945, see exhibit 36A.

TABLE III.—*Land used for crops*¹

	Acres
Sugar (1940) ²	239,451
Pineapples (1940) ³	48,598
Coffee (1940) ⁴	4,136
Macadamia nuts (1945).....	770
Fruits (1945).....	2,090
Taro and field crops (1945).....	2,067
Truck crops (1945).....	6,760
Other (1945).....	5,438
Total.....	309,310

¹ 1940 census and 1945 Agricultural Extension Service reports.² For recent figure see exhibit 7b and statement 55 showing 220,000 acres as an average figure for sugar production in recent years.³ For recent figure see exhibit 11h, giving the pineapple acreage as 62,677 acres.⁴ For recent figure of 4,000 acres see table X.TABLE IV.—*All land in farms, 1940, by size of farm (1940 census of agriculture)*

	Number of farms	Acreage		Number of farms	Acreage
Under 3 acres.....	1,029	1,370	100 to 174 acres.....	60	7,579
3 to 5 acres.....	1,065	4,341	175 to 259 acres.....	40	8,475
6 to 9 acres.....	776	5,633	260 to 499 acres.....	36	12,955
10 to 14 acres.....	590	6,830	500 to 999 acres.....	21	13,773
15 to 19 acres.....	362	6,062	1,000 acres and over.....	114	2,384,372
20 to 29 acres.....	370	8,814			
30 to 49 acres.....	369	14,216	Total.....	4,495	2,485,648
50 to 99 acres.....	163	11,228			

TABLE V.—*Number and type of diversified crop and livestock farms, 1944*¹

Island	Total	Food crops	Poultry	Swine	Dairy	Beef
Hawaii.....	2,120	² 1,479	395	120	39	117
Maui.....	875	208	310	224	31	104
Oahu.....	1,906	959	605	402	42	22
Kauai.....	654	287	88	141	11	127
Molokai.....	86	36	14	28	6	2
Lanai.....	4		2	1		1
Total.....	5,645	2,967	1,414	916	129	373
Less duplication.....	135					
Total number of diversified farms in Territory (1944).....	³ 5,510					

¹ Agricultural Extension Service Statistical Memorandum No. 2.² Includes 868 coffee farms and 259 truck farms.³ Includes 2,158 part-time farms.TABLE VI.—*Irrigated acreage by counties (1940 census)*

	Acres
Hawaii County.....	7,325
City and county of Honolulu.....	45,938
Kauai County.....	41,373
Maui and Kalawao Counties.....	36,025
Total.....	132,661

TABLE VII.—*Estimated production, marketing, and value of animal products*

	Year	Number of head on farms	Marketings of beef and veal during year	Wholesale value of marketings
Beef cattle.....	1930	¹ 138, 316		
Do.....	1940	¹ 139, 078	16, 500, 000	¹ \$2, 700, 000
Do.....	1942	² 136, 097		
Do.....	1943		17, 000, 000	² 3, 400, 000
Do.....	1944		16, 400, 000	² 3, 280, 000
Swine.....	1930	30, 563		
Do.....	1940	31, 684		
Do.....	1942	48, 840	5, 000, 000	1, 400, 000
Do.....	1943	65, 186	7, 000, 000	² 2, 000, 000
Do.....	1944	89, 554	10, 000, 000	² 2, 800, 000
Do.....	1945 ⁴	89, 821		

Increased garbage supplies permitted wartime expansion without additional imports of feeds. Trend is now downward.

	Year	Number of head on farms	Annual milk production (quarts)	Annual value
Dairy cattle.....	1930	16, 289	12, 256, 960	
Do.....	1938	8, 663	24, 000, 000	\$2, 400, 000
Do.....	1939	18, 287	20, 631, 340	¹ 1, 967, 989
Do.....	1943	² 9, 858	30, 000, 000	² 3, 600, 000
Do.....	1944	² 9, 687	31, 000, 000	² 3, 720, 000
		Number of laying hens on farms	Marketings of eggs (dozens)	Value of eggs marketed
Poultry.....	1930	270, 523	1, 329, 777	\$854, 143
Do.....	1937	220, 523	2, 232, 000	700, 000
Do.....	1939	272, 500	2, 053, 650	¹ 830, 426
Do.....	1942	273, 886	2, 850, 000	² 2, 139, 500
Do.....	1944	300, 000	3, 550, 000	² 2, 652, 500

A shortage of shipping to bring in feed from the mainland prevented any great increase in the poultry industry during the war.

	Year	Number of apiaries	Number of colonies	Honey produced (pounds)
Bees.....	1936-37		14, 000	912, 000
Do.....	1939-40	75	10, 557	880, 396

¹ U. S. Census.

² Food Production Office Reports.

³ Agricultural Extension Service Statistical Memorandum No. 2.

⁴ June 30.

TABLE VIII.—*Feed production and value*

	Year	Acres	Tons	Value
Field corn.....	1939	1, 862	816	
Do.....	1943	3, 613	2, 600	\$128, 000
Do.....	1944	3, 857	1, 300	102, 000
Do.....	1945	1, 178	396	31, 680

SUGAR AND PINEAPPLE BYPRODUCTS USED AS FEED

Year	Cane molasses (tons)	Value	Pineapple sirup (tons)	Value	Pineapple bran (tons)	Value	Pineapple pulp (wet) (tons)	Value
1938.....	15, 611	\$78, 055						
1939.....	17, 206	86, 030						
1940.....	21, 844	109, 220						
1941.....	27, 819	139, 595						
1942.....	23, 660	118, 300	1, 518	\$15, 120	14, 156	\$297, 276	19, 945	\$69, 807
1943.....	22, 059	110, 295	1, 593	15, 930	12, 536	263, 256	19, 464	68, 124

Kiawe beans, avocados, and sweet potatoes are used to some extent as feed for hogs or cattle. Cane tops, milo maize, and koa haele are used as green feed for dairy cattle.

TABLE IX.—*Estimated acreage, production, and value of food crops, 1941, 1943, 1944, and preliminary estimates for 1945*

TRUCK CROPS

	Acreage				Production (thousands of pounds)				Value (thousands of dollars)		
	1945	1944	1943	1941	1945 ¹	1944	1943	1941	1944	1943	1941
*Asparagus.....	56	54	78	93	57	36	89	80	8	18	25
Beans, lima.....	9	30	24	(9)	50	127	164	(50)	9	11	(3)
Beans, snap.....	375	694	541	407	2,439	3,485	3,249	2,041	281	260	163
Beets.....	45	66	94	42	546	611	757	334	24	30	9
Broccoli.....	72	95	182	90	439	374	540	270	45	54	25
Burdock.....	14	12	10	23	287	273	129	460	41	15	27
Cabbage, head.....	780	900	958	1,400	8,206	9,579	7,646	11,195	383	305	336
Cabbage, oriental.....	300	253	143	273	2,885	3,009	1,428	2,734	181	85	134
Carrots.....	367	461	366	228	2,469	3,545	2,909	1,823	213	175	54
Cauliflower ²	228	86	21	-----	1,359	477	91	-----	77	14	-----
Celery ³	123	107	33	-----	3,637	2,323	746	-----	372	110	-----
Corn, green.....	618	732	770	308	2,675	3,543	3,108	1,224	144	124	33
Cucumbers.....	663	543	331	285	5,223	3,920	2,647	2,278	315	264	170
Daikon ⁴	156	179	-----	(150)	2,418	2,971	-----	(2,000)	119	-----	(28)
Eggplant.....	71	56	91	114	1,191	1,087	912	1,137	63	46	45
Lettuce.....	733	653	156	110	5,097	4,885	1,983	1,083	586	198	60
Onions, green.....	91	78	37	(35)	1,549	1,504	507	(500)	24	51	(30)
Peas (all types).....	72	70	25	(25)	182	188	79	(75)	85	36	(28)
Peppers, sweet.....	103	91	64	66	747	442	319	332	66	48	37
Pumpkins.....	113	72	58	25	389	525	580	256	24	29	9
Rhubarb.....	3	2	2	2	55	120	58	(50)	10	5	(2)
Squash ⁵	64	81	40	21	533	822	538	(70)	58	(43)	(2)
Squash, other.....	48	22	18	(18)	226	379	147	(145)	20	7	(7)
Tomatoes.....	1,035	1,190	555	485	11,632	10,685	5,545	4,851	1,286	550	291
Tomatoes, plum.....	10	40	114	46	30	279	795	321	21	64	19
Turnips ⁶	66	66	223	(40)	731	609	2,742	(400)	24	(110)	(6)
Watercress.....	25	26	25	25	1,698	1,696	1,003	(1005)	119	100	(50)
Watermelons.....	493	285	346	325	3,304	2,339	1,745	2,598	187	140	197
Yam bean root.....	27	10	10	10	(150)	56	25	(100)	(3)	1	(4)
Total.....	6,760	6,954	5,315	4,655	60,204	59,889	40,481	37,412	4,788	2,893	1,794

FIELD CROPS

Beans, dry.....	10	(10)	60	(60)	21	24	103	(110)	2	6	(6)
Dasheens.....	18	17	22	(25)	137	293	304	(340)	13	15	(15)
Ginger.....	28	10	11	(12)	323	277	254	(380)	28	20	(29)
Lotus root.....	48	40	51	62	300	323	279	631	39	28	40
Onions, dry.....	92	105	69	21	486	768	230	211	54	14	9
Peanuts.....	57	76	87	75	126	155	199	75	23	24	8
Potatoes.....	547	1,174	1,575	680	4,315	7,131	10,359	6,787	392	414	202
Rice.....	116	175	296	546	443	910	1,433	(2,041)	91	112	(82)
Sweet potatoes.....	291	294	273	155	1,788	2,000	2,361	2,349	90	94	47
Taro.....	860	950	1,042	920	16,750	15,372	17,136	18,126	540	600	544
Total.....	2,067	2,851	3,486	2,556	24,689	27,253	32,658	31,050	1,272	1,327	982

FRUIT AND NUT CROPS

Avocados.....	264	265	468	(500)	1,725	2,148	1,491	(1,500)	215	149	(90)
Bananas.....	957	960	690	(765)	6,725	6,293	6,378	(12,000)	283	219	(480)
Bananas, cooking.....	19	21	17	(20)	121	127	76	(100)	9	5	(5)
Grapes.....	26	22	21	(25)	46	59	91	(90)	24	36	(8)
Limes.....	8	9	7	(8)	25	46	66	(65)	4	7	(5)
Macadamia nuts.....	770	696	667	(667)	585	553	380	(350)	77	38	(35)
Mangos (cultivated).....	227	162	129	(125)	148	122	79	(50)	31	20	(10)
Oranges.....	29	27	24	(24)	309	362	191	(200)	25	13	(3)
Papayas.....	545	544	352	465	6,922	6,010	5,320	5,307	241	202	143
Tangerines.....	15	5	3	(3)	90	93	29	(50)	9	3	(3)
Total.....	2,860	2,711	2,378	2,542	16,696	15,813	14,101	19,712	918	692	782
Total, fruits, vegetables, and nuts.....	11,687	12,516	11,179	9,813	101,589	102,955	87,240	88,174	6,978	4,912	3,558

¹ Preliminary.² Very small production.³ Daikon included with turnips in 1943.⁴ Summer and Italian.⁵ Including rutabagas.

Numbers in parentheses are approximations.

TABLE X.—*Production trends of rice, coffee, and macadamia nuts*

Year	Acreage	Pounds	Value	Year	Acreage	Pounds	Value
Rice: ¹				Coffee, green—Con.			
1930.....	2, 045	7, 582, 067	\$208, 500	1943-44.....		6, 768, 953	\$1, 000, 000
1931.....	1, 126	3, 378, 000	101, 300	1944-45.....	4, 000	7, 656, 048	1, 225, 000
1932.....	971	3, 065, 700	84, 300				
1933.....	825	3, 135, 000	109, 700			Processed	Retail
1934.....	1, 090	4, 033, 000	161, 300			nuts	value,
1935.....	1, 130	3, 818, 854	162, 300			(pounds)	processed ²
1936.....	1, 200	3, 250, 000	190, 900				
1937.....	1, 276	3, 625, 000	247, 863				
1938.....	645	2, 320, 000	-----	Macadamia			
1939.....	528	2, 206, 000	-----	nuts: ^{1, 2}			
1940.....	546	2, 041, 000	-----	1932.....	423	2, 000	\$200
1944.....	175	910, 000	90, 000	1933.....	517	5, 500	825
Coffee, green: ¹				1934.....	624	31, 020	13, 959
1930-31.....	6, 000	10, 000, 487	1, 740, 084	1935.....	634	49, 960	22, 097
1931-32.....		9, 808, 095	1, 539, 878	1936.....	741	87, 865	35, 024
1932-33.....		9, 233, 141	1, 098, 743	1937.....	816	134, 092	60, 039
1933-34.....		10, 387, 629	1, 454, 268	1938.....	1, 086	228, 500	103, 825
1934-35.....		9, 658, 834	1, 101, 107	1939.....		181, 159	-----
1935-36.....	5, 550	9, 828, 140	1, 089, 940			Unshelled	Wholesale
1936-37.....		9, 046, 589	977, 032			(pounds)	value, un-
1937-38.....		8, 079, 358	912, 967				shelled ¹
1938-39.....		8, 454, 388	946, 891				
1939-40.....		8, 001, 501	928, 181				
1940-41.....	4, 200	8, 317, 000	-----	1943.....	667	380, 000	\$38, 000
1941-42.....	4, 000	7, 000, 000	-----	1944.....	696	553, 000	77, 090
1942-43.....		7, 193, 255	-----	1945.....	770	585, 000	81, 900

¹ Extension Service reports.² First Progress Report, Territorial Planning Board, 1939.TABLE XI.—*Continental United States and Hawaiian trade in agricultural products, 1937-40, with summary of value of all products*¹

DIVERSIFIED AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS

Year	SHIPMENTS TO CONTI- NENTAL UNITED STATES		SHIPMENTS FROM CONTI- NENTAL UNITED STATES	
	Meat products and tallow		Meat products	
	Pounds	Value	Pounds	Value
1937.....	590, 695	\$47, 816	22, 865, 024	\$4, 166, 336
1938.....	486, 684	28, 530	28, 743, 217	5, 076, 416
1939.....	938, 909	54, 277	26, 994, 920	4, 891, 409
1940.....	402, 430	18, 040	32, 001, 960	5, 626, 125
	Cattle hides		Animal oils and fats, edible	
1937.....	1, 613, 092	\$187, 705	322, 059	\$40, 770
1938.....	1, 323, 049	123, 823	624, 400	65, 639
1939.....	1, 395, 370	148, 511	493, 507	54, 477
1940.....	1, 579, 477	160, 487	601, 726	64, 325
			Eggs in shell	
			Dozens	
1937.....			2, 025, 740	\$549, 592
1938.....			2, 653, 558	746, 476
1939.....			2, 430, 726	678, 930
1940.....			2, 981, 093	771, 152

¹ Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

TABLE XI.—Continental United States and Hawaiian trade in agricultural products, 1937-40, with summary of value of all products—Continued

DIVERSIFIED AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS

Year	SHIPMENTS TO CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES		SHIPMENTS FROM CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES	
			Dairy products: Milk and cream, fresh and sterilized	
			<i>Gallons</i>	
1937.....			11,000	\$5,898
1938.....			22,981	13,353
1939.....			22,236	24,876
1940.....			48,776	66,922
			Other dairy products: Condensed and evaporated milk, butter, cheese, malts, etc.	
			<i>Pounds</i>	
1937.....			18,064,572	\$2,278,572
1938.....			19,787,109	2,342,719
1939.....			20,932,118	2,403,128
1940.....			22,055,611	2,899,517
	Canned and frozen fish products		Fish, shellfish: Fresh, canned, dried	
1937.....	1,968,359	\$416,641	7,183,826	\$972,971
1938.....	7,767,664	1,607,986	6,833,562	956,548
1939.....	3,394,050	738,930	7,185,321	949,246
1940.....	4,885,757	1,012,705	6,995,346	1,013,590
	Honey		Fodders and feeds	
			<i>Tons</i>	
1937.....	848,726	\$38,729	40,992	\$1,702,007
1938.....	1,083,940	44,175	51,171	1,641,750
1939.....	1,006,791	32,960	51,322	1,679,887
1940.....	1,081,053	39,685	48,005	1,622,991
	Beeswax		Barley, corn, corn meal, oats, and wheat	
			<i>Bushels</i>	
1937.....	17,678	\$4,354	273,242	\$277,845
1938.....	19,437	3,928	369,096	291,705
1939.....	61,161	13,822	443,215	322,732
1940.....	9,609	1,995	417,610	345,025
			Rice	
			<i>Pounds</i>	
1937.....			72,344,912	\$2,771,631
1938.....			79,510,560	2,688,986
1939.....			83,940,869	2,625,592
1940.....			82,870,689	2,700,442

TABLE XI.—Continental United States and Hawaiian trade in agricultural products, 1937-40, with summary of value of all products—Continued

DIVERSIFIED AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS—Continued

Year	SHIPMENTS TO CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES		SHIPMENTS FROM CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES	
	Coffee, green		Coffee, green	
1937.....	4, 075, 551	\$439, 439	30, 998	\$3, 952
1938.....	2, 523, 894	286, 165	282, 163	25, 450
1939.....	2, 479, 048	288, 838	568, 504	39, 066
1940.....	1, 322, 280	128, 518	365, 797	24, 960
Coffee, roasted				
1937.....			786, 005	\$145, 954
1938.....			1, 042, 696	195, 755
1939.....			938, 411	198, 701
1940.....			949, 187	219, 837
Nuts				
1937.....	111, 433	\$15, 399	617, 474	\$126, 514
1938.....	164, 498	41, 544	742, 555	142, 074
1939.....	166, 648	46, 754	682, 986	131, 327
1940.....	299, 368	67, 990	1, 007, 594	202, 001

VEGETABLES

	Potatoes		Potatoes	
1937.....	3, 419, 544	\$134, 620	19, 233, 971	\$308, 352
1938.....	4, 907, 294	183, 908	22, 711, 386	243, 376
1939.....	1, 272, 140	50, 892	21, 679, 424	264, 342
1940.....	2, 511, 728	100, 428	26, 022, 677	349, 988
Other vegetables				
1937.....	509, 401	\$36, 270	22, 401, 032	\$426, 188
1938.....	633, 435	41, 478	25, 551, 732	591, 869
1939.....	519, 987	38, 847	23, 623, 641	393, 278
1940.....	579, 055	41, 177	30, 418, 249	518, 241
Beans and peas, dry				
1937.....			1, 405, 215	\$67, 541
1938.....			1, 464, 191	61, 738
1939.....			1, 118, 384	43, 898
1940.....			1, 232, 677	63, 547
Vegetables, canned				
1937.....			9, 314, 566	\$705, 392
1938.....			9, 253, 451	725, 326
1939.....			11, 645, 485	842, 474
1940.....			14, 301, 049	1, 075, 629

¹ Quantity adjusted from annual unload summaries..

TABLE XI.—Continental United States and Hawaiian trade in agricultural products, 1937-40, with summary of value of all products—Continued

FRUITS

Year	SHIPMENTS TO CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES		SHIPMENTS FROM CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES	
	Bananas		Fruits, citrus	
	<i>Bunches</i>		<i>Boxes</i>	
1937.....	91,320	\$86,409	190,751	\$723,977
1938.....	113,577	112,754	317,519	625,802
1939.....	114,835	114,555	292,967	638,906
1940.....	105,332	91,306	371,188	814,892
	Papayas, fresh		Fruits, other fresh ¹	
	<i>Pounds</i>		<i>Pounds</i>	
1937.....			23,733,099	\$451,336
1938.....			32,986,241	436,117
1939.....	176,261	\$21,368	31,821,508	448,427
1940.....	227,553	18,081	40,839,242	542,068
	Papaya juice, canned		Fruits, dried and evaporated	
	<i>Pounds</i>		<i>Pounds</i>	
1937.....	1,127,013	\$82,930	1,219,189	\$89,087
1938.....	1,051,393	71,506	1,324,557	87,103
1939.....	622,390	46,099	1,232,674	78,558
1940.....	605,287	55,246	1,247,724	84,916
	Pineapples, fresh		Fruits, canned	
	<i>Boxes</i>			
1937.....	25,564	\$63,225	4,279,103	\$327,910
1938.....	63,600	140,710	4,497,662	305,620
1939.....	122,569	230,188	4,742,044	303,878
1940.....	97,144	178,671	5,404,762	356,533
Total value of diversified products 1940.....		1,914,329		19,362,701
	Pineapples, canned and preserved, juice, and syrup			
	<i>Pounds</i>			
1937.....	879,798,258	\$59,417,679		
1938.....	594,251,012	37,868,512		
1939.....	848,102,695	50,846,728		
1940.....	786,616,655	45,720,688		
	Sugar, refined and unrefined		Sugar, refined	
	<i>Thousands of pounds</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>Thousands of pounds</i>	<i>Value</i>
1937.....	1,855,060	\$63,575,478	966	\$49,517
1938.....	1,784,946	50,743,327	2,104	104,305
1939.....	1,867,429	55,217,960	1,446	72,016
1940.....	1,744,394	47,266,417	1,136	61,988
	Molasses			
	<i>Gallons</i>	<i>Value</i>		
1937.....	31,015,485	\$781,609		
1938.....	28,141,249	655,262		
1939.....	28,979,434	651,608		
1940.....	31,842,251	647,116		
Total value of sugar and pineapple products, 1940.....		93,634,221		61,988
Grand total value of agricultural products, 1940.....		95,548,550		19,424,639

TABLE XII.—*Origin of fresh fruit and vegetable receipts at Honolulu, 1941 and 1944 (expressed as percentage of total receipts)*

[Data taken from Agricultural Extension Circular No. 176]

RECEIPTS IN THOUSANDS OF POUNDS

Source	1944		1941	
	Thousands of pounds	Percent	Thousands of pounds	Percent
Hawaii.....	11,468	11.0	9,598	6.0
Maul.....	849	.8	6,551	4.0
Kauai.....	1,086	1.0	2,136	1.0
Molokai.....	684	.7	1,114	.7
Total, outlying islands ¹	14,087	14.0	19,399	12.0
Oahu estimated production ²	45,883	44.0	38,104	24.0
Total, Territorial receipts.....	59,970	58.0	57,503	36.0
Mainland ^{1,3}	44,219	42.0	102,151	64.0
Foreign countries ¹			14	.008
Total receipts.....	104,189		159,668	

¹ Steamer unloads² Estimated truck receipts³ Mainland unloads in 1944 represent civilian supplies only; the 1941 figure covers some Army-Navy supplies.

EXHIBIT 10A. PRESENTED BY THE HAWAIIAN EQUAL RIGHTS COMMISSION

Trans-Pacific ship departures from Hawaii, 1922-41

	Steam vessels	Sailing vessels	Gross tonnage of vessels	Cargo (tons)
All Hawaiian ports:				
Calendar year—				
1922.....	871	61	6,090,145	1,966,244
1923.....	874	53	6,580,557	2,086,548
1924.....	924	42	6,899,681	2,186,986
1925.....	1,035	31	7,993,137	2,456,680
1926.....	1,094	14	8,336,452	2,716,815
1927.....	1,088	10	8,228,331	4,321,076
1928.....	1,256	10	9,708,060	4,406,066
1929.....	1,319	7	10,203,194	4,693,254
1930.....	1,400	7	10,807,037	3,497,280
1931.....	1,278	5	10,342,287	3,447,302
1932.....	1,224	7	10,316,551	2,488,996
Fiscal year ending June 30—				
1933.....	1,096	6	9,700,684	2,454,448
1934.....	1,151	5	9,961,723	2,587,720
1935.....	1,208	3	10,402,112	2,783,473
1936.....	1,224	3	10,623,529	3,174,988
1937.....	1,261	2	9,909,677	3,290,891
1938.....	1,422	2	10,864,490	3,481,935
1939.....	1,279	6	10,159,203	3,257,708
1940.....	1,420	2	10,855,371	3,550,988
1941.....	1,667	1	11,894,458	4,540,059
Port of Honolulu:				
Calendar year—				
1922.....	626	45	4,699,088	1,792,006
1923.....	668	48	5,292,276	1,869,447
1924.....	700	37	5,478,578	1,895,091
1925.....	729	29	5,970,095	1,981,114
1926.....	745	14	6,198,604	2,227,944
1927.....	760	10	6,192,711	2,082,666
1928.....	841	10	7,052,907	2,100,599
1929.....	858	7	7,174,286	1,976,005
1930.....	896	7	7,606,889	1,926,546
1931.....	796	5	7,248,587	2,009,438
1932.....	743	7	7,098,560	1,335,750
Fiscal year ending June 30—				
1933.....	632	6	6,661,702	1,400,250
1934.....	669	5	6,895,889	1,539,205
1935.....	716	3	7,275,828	1,634,661
1936.....	718	3	7,370,141	1,963,958
1937.....	715	2	6,593,419	2,052,235
1938.....	793	2	7,178,003	2,187,158
1939.....	694	6	6,631,564	2,035,563
1940.....	870	2	7,436,354	2,299,826
1941.....	1,142	1	8,780,196	3,424,811

Source: Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce

EXHIBIT 10B. PRESENTED BY THE HAWAII EQUAL RIGHTS COMMISSION

Merchandise shipments and exports from Hawaii, 1901-41

Yearly average or year ended	To con- tinental United States	To other countries	Total	Yearly average or year ended	To con- tinental United States	To other countries	Total
June 30—				Dec. 31—Con.			
1901-05 ¹	\$28, 029, 059	\$64, 698	\$28, 093, 757	1924.....	\$108, 473, 292	\$1, 415, 911	\$109, 889, 203
1906-10 ¹	36, 842, 125	254, 956	37, 097, 102	1925.....	102, 780, 509	1, 844, 782	104, 625, 291
1909.....	40, 432, 945	84, 152	40, 517, 097	1926.....	98, 260, 941	1, 884, 079	100, 145, 020
1910.....	46, 183, 265	306, 763	46, 490, 028	1927.....	109, 236, 321	2, 267, 714	111, 504, 035
1911.....	41, 207, 651	730, 642	41, 938, 293	1928.....	116, 956, 090	2, 523, 745	119, 479, 835
1912.....	55, 076, 070	373, 273	55, 449, 343	1929.....	106, 312, 833	2, 126, 270	108, 439, 103
1913.....	42, 713, 184	758, 646	43, 471, 830	1930.....	98, 923, 737	1, 992, 046	100, 915, 783
1914.....	40, 678, 580	915, 245	41, 593, 825	1931.....	101, 548, 555	1, 189, 280	102, 737, 835
1915.....	62, 087, 250	377, 509	62, 464, 759	1932.....	82, 688, 205	760, 091	83, 448, 296
1916.....	64, 438, 297	226, 747	64, 665, 044	1933.....	92, 276, 992	675, 809	92, 952, 801
1917.....	73, 174, 343	923, 747	74, 098, 090	1934.....	94, 513, 609	1, 316, 360	95, 830, 059
1918.....	79, 392, 926	1, 553, 700	80, 946, 626	1935.....	98, 695, 969	1, 338, 027	100, 033, 996
Dec. 31—				1936.....	125, 392, 311	1, 639, 450	127, 176, 805
1918 (6 months).....	42, 224, 209	4, 152, 299	46, 376, 508	1937.....	130, 138, 166	2, 101, 648	132, 239, 814
1919.....	98, 363, 015	4, 702, 103	103, 063, 118	1938.....	96, 556, 679	1, 529, 442	98, 086, 121
1920.....	192, 383, 185	3, 437, 699	195, 820, 884	1939.....	113, 206, 898	1, 888, 911	115, 095, 809
1921.....	71, 669, 115	1, 350, 483	73, 019, 598	1940.....	102, 145, 130	922, 835	103, 067, 965
1922.....	73, 431, 301	1, 257, 268	74, 688, 569	1941.....	122, 640, 189	11, 012, 877	133, 653, 066
1923.....	101, 085, 642	1, 581, 164	102, 666, 806				

¹ Annual average.

Figures from Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

EXHIBIT 10C. PRESENTED BY THE HAWAII EQUAL RIGHTS COMMISSION

Merchandise shipments and imports to Hawaii, 1901-40

Yearly average or year ended	From con- tinental United States	From other countries	Total	Yearly average or year ended	From con- tinental United States	From other countries	Total
June 30—				Dec. 31—			
1901-05 ¹	\$11, 459, 879	\$3, 165, 296	\$14, 778, 085	1923.....	\$66, 421, 393	\$8, 684, 804	\$75, 106, 197
1906-10 ¹	15, 970, 287	4, 149, 852	20, 120, 138	1924.....	69, 767, 693	8, 884, 223	78, 651, 916
1909.....	17, 780, 778	4, 033, 574	21, 814, 352	1925.....	72, 924, 409	10, 829, 509	83, 753, 918
1910.....	20, 560, 101	4, 606, 334	25, 166, 435	1926.....	76, 262, 624	10, 254, 565	86, 517, 189
1911.....	21, 925, 177	5, 190, 449	27, 115, 626	1927.....	79, 630, 089	9, 171, 815	88, 801, 904
1912.....	24, 652, 905	5, 598, 444	30, 251, 349	1928.....	77, 762, 940	10, 361, 293	88, 124, 233
1913.....	30, 646, 089	6, 373, 531	37, 019, 620	1929.....	82, 950, 789	9, 752, 667	92, 703, 456
1914.....	25, 773, 412	6, 282, 558	32, 055, 970	1930.....	81, 726, 404	9, 399, 645	91, 126, 049
1915.....	25, 004, 764	5, 716, 023	30, 720, 787	1931.....	79, 092, 457	7, 864, 409	86, 956, 866
1916.....	31, 127, 577	6, 068, 529	37, 196, 106	1932.....	58, 578, 449	5, 051, 628	63, 630, 077
1917.....	44, 330, 475	6, 482, 951	50, 813, 426	1933.....	57, 894, 488	5, 233, 481	63, 127, 969
1918.....	43, 646, 515	6, 807, 048	50, 453, 563	1934.....	63, 472, 395	5, 761, 288	69, 233, 683
Dec. 31—				1935.....	78, 924, 776	5, 628, 108	84, 552, 884
1918 (6 months).....	19, 061, 246	5, 476, 008	24, 537, 254	1936.....	85, 743, 998	6, 718, 981	92, 462, 979
1919.....	49, 983, 869	8, 980, 704	58, 964, 573	1937.....	104, 302, 531	9, 672, 317	113, 974, 848
1920.....	74, 052, 453	12, 264, 592	86, 317, 045	1938.....	101, 227, 151	8, 254, 772	109, 478, 585
1921.....	64, 446, 173	9, 529, 755	73, 975, 928	1939.....	101, 817, 230	7, 432, 431	109, 249, 661
1922.....	53, 585, 740	7, 496, 913	61, 082, 653	1940.....	127, 439, 539	8, 099, 062	135, 538, 601

¹ Annual average.

Figures from Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

EXHIBIT 10D. PRESENTED BY THE HAWAII EQUAL RIGHTS COMMISSION

Rank of customers of continental United States in order of amount purchased

1933		1937	
1. United Kingdom	\$311, 732, 000	1. United Kingdom	\$534, 564, 000
2. Canada	210, 526, 000	2. Canada	509, 508, 000
3. Japan	143, 434, 000	3. Japan	288, 378, 000
4. Germany	139, 967, 000	4. France	164, 311, 000
5. France	121, 711, 000	5. Germany	124, 166, 000
6. Italy	61, 240, 000	6. HAWAII	104, 302, 531
7. HAWAII	57, 894, 000	7. Cuba	92, 283, 000
8. China	51, 941, 000	8. Philippines	85, 031, 000
9. Puerto Rico	51, 697, 000	9. Italy	76, 792, 000
10. Philippines	44, 782, 000	10. China	49, 697, 000
1934		1938	
1. United Kingdom	382, 749, 000	1. United Kingdom	521, 124, 000
2. Canada	302, 433, 000	2. Canada	467, 662, 000
3. Japan	210, 480, 000	3. Japan	239, 575, 000
4. France	115, 704, 000	4. France	133, 835, 000
5. Germany	108, 738, 000	5. Germany	108, 334, 000
6. China	68, 667, 000	6. HAWAII	101, 227, 151
7. Italy	64, 578, 000	7. Philippines	86, 472, 000
8. HAWAII	63, 472, 000	8. Cuba	76, 329, 000
9. Puerto Rico	59, 477, 000	9. Italy	58, 266, 000
10. Philippines	47, 129, 000	10. China	34, 772, 000
1935		1939	
1. United Kingdom	433, 385, 000	1. United Kingdom	505, 227, 000
2. Canada	323, 191, 000	2. Canada	493, 450, 000
3. Japan	203, 260, 000	3. Japan	231, 405, 000
4. France	116, 920, 000	4. France	181, 825, 000
5. Germany	91, 662, 000	5. HAWAII	101, 817, 230
6. HAWAII	78, 925, 000	6. Philippines	100, 018, 000
7. Italy	72, 450, 000	7. Cuba	81, 644, 000
8. Puerto Rico	70, 053, 000	8. Italy	58, 864, 000
9. Cuba	60, 139, 000	9. China	55, 809, 000
10. Philippines	52, 640, 000	10. Germany	51, 132, 000
1936		1940	
1. United Kingdom	439, 950, 000	1. United Kingdom	1, 009, 623, 000
2. Canada	383, 952, 000	2. Canada	714, 518, 000
3. Japan	204, 312, 000	3. France	252, 455, 000
4. France	129, 535, 000	4. Japan	227, 204, 000
5. Germany	100, 585, 000	5. HAWAII	127, 439, 539
6. Puerto Rico	86, 352, 000	6. Philippines	93, 335, 000
7. HAWAII	85, 744, 000	7. Cuba	84, 694, 000
8. Cuba	67, 432, 000	8. China	77, 956, 000
9. Philippines	60, 351, 000	9. Italy	51, 473, 000

Source: Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

EXHIBIT 11A. PRESENTED BY THE HAWAII EQUAL RIGHTS COMMISSION

Territory of Hawaii, department of labor and industrial relations, bureau of research and statistics

HAWAII LABOR LAWS (REVISED LAWS 1945)

PART I. GENERAL

The Revised Laws of 1945, as amended by the Session Laws of 1945, shows the following statutes pertaining to labor:

Apprenticeship.—Territorial apprenticeship council and director of apprenticeship appointed to carry on apprenticeship program in Territory, with standards established for agreements. Participation voluntary (secs. 4141-4147, amended Act 22, 1945).

Child labor.—Certification up to 18 years by commission of labor and industrial relations required (agents of children's bureau as to proof of age under federal laws). Hours of minors under 14 years not over 30 weekly or 6 hours daily; minors 14 to 16 permitted to work 40 hours weekly and 8 hours daily; 16 to 18, no hourly restriction; lunch period provided. Hazardous occupation up to 18 forbidden. Exempts newspaper sale or distribution, domestic service, employment by parent or guardian (unless in a forbidden occupation), agricultural labor outside school hours if over 16 years old, employment by government agencies (secs. 4121-4122, amended Act 9, Laws 1945; 4122 repealed).

Citizen and residence requirements.—Labor on public contracts must be citizen. If impractical, noncitizens may be employed only on authorization by head of the political subdivision affected (sec. 358). Public-utility employees must have at least 3 years' residence in Territory (sec. 4741).

Contract, emigrant, and immigrant labor.—Statutes protecting the contract labor and forbidding the enticing away of such labor; emigrant agents required to pay license fees and to put up bonds, willful misleading of such labor illegal; the Secretary of Hawaii designated to investigate the welfare of immigrant labor and to gather information as to unemployment, labor supply, etc. (secs. 7054-7062, 10391-10392, 11523-11525, 12915).

Employment agencies, commercial.—License fee \$10 as in 1935; regulation by commission of labor and industrial relations, who issue permits for operation (secs. 4119, 7063).

Employment relations board.—"The Little Wagner Act," giving agricultural labor in Hawaii same rights as nonagricultural have under National Labor Relations Act. Board of three unpaid members and one paid full-time conciliator; unfair labor practices by both employer and employee defined; procedure for mediation; penalties for interference with board in performing duties. Board to maintain list of labor organizations (Act 250, 1945, adds sec. 4150).

Employment service, free.—Public service established, in conformity with congressional act of June 1933; cooperates with States and Railroad Retirement Board. Takes claims for unemployment compensation and veterans readjustment, latter under cooperating agreement with Veterans' Administration. (Presently under Federal administration. Sec. 4282.)

Labor and industrial relations, department of.—Governor appoints five members (serving without pay) who appoint director to administer act. Four bureaus.—(1) workmen's compensation, formerly industrial accident boards, (2) unemployment compensation, formerly unemployment compensation board and county commissions, (3) labor law enforcement, with child-labor division and wage and hour division, (4) research and statistics. Director of apprenticeship and program of that division under supervision of director LIR; safety inspection division enforces safety regulations made by the commission. Mediation of labor disputes provided; procedure for "cooling off" period in public utility labor disputes under director (secs. 4101-4467).

Labor organizations.—Sabotage Act of 1941 stipulates it does not impair right of labor to self-organization, collective bargaining, or concerted activities (sec. 11631). Labor organizations register with employment relations board (see that title) (sec. 4150.14) Act 250, 1945).

Military service.—Income tax deferment 6 months after discharge, and no interest charged (sec. 5518); discharge photostated and recorded free (sec. 12763); exemptions from income-tax payment specified (sec. 5506); unemployment compensation rights protected to June 30, 1947 (sec. 4218-4225, amended by Act 19).

Prison labor and pay.—Under control of department of institutions; maximum pay not over 50 percent of value of product credited to prisoner (secs. 3932-3938, amended Act 247).

Public utilities—labor disputes.—Time period set for mediation of differences and procedure outlined; penalty for strikes or lock-outs (sec. 4161-4174).

Public-works employees.—Must be citizens, minimum daily wage \$3, maximum day of 8 hours except in emergency (sec. 451-452, 362).

Safety regulations.—See department of labor and industrial relations (sec. 4112).

Sunday labor.—Section 11611–11615, suspended during emergency by joint resolution 1943. (Emergency defined as period during which Hawaii Defense Act is in effect.)

Taxation withheld.—Compensation and dividends tax of 2 percent of gross pay. Seventy-five percent of amount withheld may be credited against income tax due. Five-tenths or six-tenths of 1 percent, as necessary, used for public welfare. (Poll tax repealed in 1943.) (Secs. 5341–5349, amended 1945, Acts 121, 208.)

Taxation, income.—Exemptions as in 1935 (\$2,000 married, \$1,000 single) except exemption of dependent extended to children up to 21 years attending school. Tax rates same. No return necessary if the credit on compensation and dividends tax equals or exceeds tax due; no return if gross income is less than \$4,000 and exemptions at least \$1,000. Maximum for charity deductions raised to 15 percent. Job expenses permitted for individuals. Exempts armed forces but includes civilians on government pay rolls (secs. 5501–5541, amended 1945, Act 92).

Unemployment compensation.—Covers all employers—except specific exemptions—having one or more employees. Contribution rates based on benefit experience account of each employer (employer taking over a going business may combine his and predecessor's experience), with percentage in relation to the ratio of his reserve to his annual average pay roll over 3 years; ratio under 4 percent, rate standard 2.7; ratio 4 to 6 percent, contribution rate 2 percent; ratio 6 to 8 percent, contribution 1 percent; ratio over 8 percent, rate zero. Benefit rights of those in military service up to June 30, 1947, protected. Restrictions of payments to women quitting work because of pregnancy or marital obligations. Referee on all unemployment benefit appeals. Provisions liberalized for seasonal industries during war period. Maximum weekly benefit \$25, with maximum total in a benefit year \$500, uniform duration of 20 weeks (potential) qualifying wages in base period \$750 to obtain maximum (secs. 4201–4301, amended 1945, Acts 19 and 179).

Vocational educational and training.—Provisions of 1935 sections amended to expand vocational training program, especially in agriculture, diversified farming, and farm mechanics. Advisory board on vocational education created 1945, with territorial director of apprenticeship specified as member. Private vocational schools licensed under qualifying conditions (secs. 1891–1893, amended 1945, Act 219).

Vocational rehabilitation.—Territorial board cooperates with Federal board, submits plans to Federal agencies in order to obtain funds; cooperation with workmen's compensation bureau provided; covers persons over school age in tubercular hospitals; tools, equipment, and prosthetic devices may be transferred to handicapped individuals requiring them in rehabilitation (secs. 1894–1898, amended 1945, Act 117).

Veterans' laws.—See separate listing. Also see cooperating agreement between bureau of unemployment compensation and the Veterans' Administration on administration of Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, in Hawaii. Council on veterans' affairs created 1945 and regional office of Administration requested. Reemployment and retirement rights covered under laws affecting Government employees.

Wages, collection and payment.—Wages must be paid immediately on discharge or at next customary pay due on voluntary quit; if amount in dispute, employer must pay amount he concedes without causing waiver of amount in dispute. Penalties for failure to pay, enforced by director of labor and industrial relations. Wages up to \$200 may be collected in small claims courts, with no costs except docket fee and mailing. Director of labor and industrial relations authorized to assist in collecting wages up to \$200, take assignment, etc. Director or representative also authorizes to secure restitution of illegal deductions, and of amounts due under wage and hour law (secs. 4114, 4351–4366, 4381–4385, amended 1945, Acts 11, 15). Actions in territorial courts under Federal statutes limited to 1 year from date of cause (sec. 10429.01, amended 1945, Act 174).

Wages, deductions.—Penalty for deductions from wages without written authorization, misdemeanor, and penalty for deduction to pay workmen's compensation insurance (same as 1935). Director or representative discovering illegal deductions in course of wage or hour inspection may secure restitution (secs. 4363, 4383–4385, 4462, amended 1945, Acts 11, 15).

Wages, garnishment.—Procedures and exemptions, some amendments since 1935. Unemployment compensation benefits, insurance policy proceeds, assistance payments, now exempt. Amount sequestered reduced to 10 percent of earnings under \$100 monthly and 20 percent over \$100 monthly (secs. 8545, 10301-10315, amended 1945, Act 240).

Wages, minimum; and hours, maximum.—As of July 1, 1945, minimum hourly wage throughout Territory 40 cents, maximum weekly hours on straight time 48 (overtime at time and half any work over 48 hours); no split shifts unless all shifts within period of 24 hours fall within 14 consecutive hours—emergencies excepted. Wage and hour division of department of labor and industrial relations administers. Director authorized to collect wages due under the law and liquidated damages. Penalties for failure to keep pay-roll records and for divulging information in violation of specific provisions. Exempts those earning over \$150 monthly, agricultural employment during any week in which employee hires less than 20 persons, domestic service, family employment, executives and professional persons, outside salesmen and collectors, certain fishing processes, seamen, religious orders, voluntary services for hospitals, religious, fraternal, or charitable organizations, and employees covered by Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938. Subminimum for minors 14 years and under only on waiver by commission of labor and industrial relations; subminimum for learners, apprentices, or handicapped persons only under regulations of the commission (secs. 4351-4366, amended 1945, Act 15).

Workmen's compensation.—Covers industrial employment as defined by the law, excludes those making over \$100 weekly and public employees making more than \$4,800 yearly, but employees not covered in definition or hiring employees making more than \$100 may elect to secure insurance under provisions of the act. Maximum weekly payments \$25, total \$7,500; attendant at \$50 monthly during total disability not included in this maximum. Minimum penalty \$25 for failure to secure insurance. Employer must report all injuries within 15 days after he has knowledge of injury causing absence of more than 1 day or requiring more than ordinary first aid; penalty for failure to report \$100 or imprisonment 90 days. Maximum burial expense \$200. Special compensation fund, for second injury payments, into which is deposited \$500 when no beneficiaries to receive death benefits. Director of labor and industrial relations makes awards. Appeal board of three members for Honolulu City and County, industrial accident boards of five members each for other counties—appointed by Governor (secs. 4401-4467, amended 1945, Acts 10, 160, 257).

Workmen's compensation for volunteers.—1943 session appropriated \$50,000 for compensation to volunteers injured in course of duties for specified organizations of military or semimilitary nature; coverage continues 6 months after President proclaims termination World War II, benefits retroactive as if in effect December 7, 1941 (secs. 4463-4467, amended 1945, Act 160).

PART II. GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Citizenship and residence requirements.—Officers and employees must be citizens of United States and residence of Territory at least 3 years—exception teachers over elementary and grammar schools, as to residence. Other appointments, if necessary, only when approved by appropriate government official named in law (secs. 451-452).

Civil service.—Merit system for all government employees. Civil service commission appointed by Governor, director of personnel appointed by Commissioner (secs. 61-80).

Classification.—Position classification system and compensation schedule according to classification (secs. 101-124, Act 263, Laws 1945, adds 125).

Employee organizations.—Employees may, without being dismissed or demoted, belong to organizations not affiliated with "outside organizations" imposing obligation to strike (sec. 80).

Hours per day.—Office hours specified for territorial and county offices. Working days consist of 8 hours of actual service, with the lunch hours considered service, Monday through Friday, and 5 hours Saturday (secs. 359, 477, 6208, 6530).

Loyalty law.—Requires signing of loyalty oath by officers and employees within 60 days of appointment date. Provisions as to waiver, extension of time, or duplication of oath (secs. 600-616, amended 1945, Act 131).

Military service.—Government employees shall report to National Guard in event of war, insurrection, or rebellion (sec. 13032). Pay, up to 21 days, for duty in camp, maneuvers, etc., on call of President or Governor (sec. 554. See Veterans).

Pensions.—General provisions as to payment, etc. Minimum \$30 monthly, plus \$25 bonus up to June 30, 1947 (secs. 631–635, 6191, amended Laws 1945, Acts 175, 218). City and county system, pensions for certain employees not eligible to retirement system (sec. 6184–6190, amended 1945, Act 264). Hawaii, Maui, and Kauai police department systems (secs. 6399, 6444, 6480). Police, fire, and bandsmen, Honolulu (secs. 6171–6183).

Prison labor and pay.—Labor only for Government or charitable institutions, controlled by department of institutions, classification procedure and determination compensation stipulated, maximum pay 50 percent of net value of product (secs. 3932–3938, amended 1945, Act 247).

Retirement system.—Covers Territorial and political subdivision, with specific exceptions. Includes persons having some of salary paid by Federal Government, who are not members of Federal retirement system. Mandatory after 6 months' employment. Deductions from pay at percentage based on age at entrance. Retirement pay one-seventieth of average annual pay last years multiplied by years of service. No withdrawal after 5 years in system, until retirement. Bonus of \$25 monthly to June 30, 1947, added to pensions under retirement (secs. 701–721, amended 1945, Acts 25, 73, 175).

Salaries, bonuses.—Additional compensation May 1, 1943, to June 30, 1945, ranging from \$5 to \$25 monthly, superseded by bonus of \$50 monthly, effective January 1, 1944, to June 30, 1945. Effective July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1947, additional compensation \$45 monthly, all employees (secs. 125, 1758, 6550–6555, Acts 13, 263, 1945).

Salaries, general provisions.—Salary must be paid immediately on termination, for whatever cause (sec. 456). No salary if absent from Territory over 2 months (sec. 454). Per diem expenses on Government business \$10 (sec. 455).

Salaries, garnishment, and withholding.—Garnishment proceedings and exemptions of certain Government beneficiaries. (See secs. 10321–10337.) Pay officer may withhold from pay for indebtedness to Government, one-fourth each pay day until total is paid; in case of embezzlement or theft, shall withhold all until total is paid. Salary also withheld for failure to file inventory as required (secs. 453, 1655, amended 1945, Act 151).

Salary reductions or increases.—Cuts by 1932 and 1933 Laws were restored July 1, 1935, and January 1, 1936. No salary increases without legislative action. Base pay, monthly, increased \$20 as of July 1, 1945 (sec. 110).

Salary schedules.—Hawaiian standard, for Territory (sec. 112–116, amended 1945, Act 263); public schools, single standard schedule (secs. 1756–1766, amended 1945, Act 263); courts (secs. 9771–9783, amended, 1945, Act 35); Hawaii County and police department (secs. 6352, 6401); Honolulu City and County (secs. 6543, 6548); Maui County and police (secs. 6451, 6482); Kauai County and police (secs. 6411, 6445); Honolulu fire and police (secs. 6550–6555).

Vacations and leaves.—Vacations figured at 1½ working days per month of service, with 21 working days per month considered month of service; total accumulation limited to 54 working days. Sick leave same; may be extended by appropriate Government head. Cash may be paid in lieu of vacation when circumstances make it impossible to take vacation, as in war emergency (secs. 550–551, 553, and secs. 559–561, amended 1945, Act 176).

Teachers given sabbatical year of leave, for educational purposes, after 8 years' service. Attendance at summer schools provided for certain teachers (secs. 1751–1754). Members of welfare department staff to have educational leave (sec. 4827.9, amended 1945, Act 157).

Veterans' rights.—Government employees may apply for reemployment within 40 days after discharge; incumbent in position shall be dismissed and veteran reappointed, without loss of any credits, at same status as to pay, seniority, etc., as if he had served continuously and maintained efficiency standards (secs. 555–558, amended 1945, Acts 114, 184, 263). Retirement contributions also paid for member in military service during his absence on leave, and he is given service credits (secs. 719–721). Merchant marine and civilians serving without pay for armed forces included in these rights.

Volunteer workers.—Persons working for the Territory without pay entitled to hospitalization and medical care, free, if injured while doing such work (sec. 4467.01-4, amended 1945, Act 257).

PART III. VETERANS

Burial.—Expenses, up to \$125 per individual, paid on voucher of board of health, for honorably discharged resident veterans (secs. 13105-13107, amended 1945, Act 198).

Civil-service preference.—Given credit of 5 percent of total score in examinations (sec. 80).

Council on veterans' affairs.—Created by Act 150, Laws 1945, adding section 13108.

Discharge record.—Bureau of conveyances records and photostats gratis, furnished one copy at 25 cents (sec. 12763).

Education, adult.—No fee for adult education program, unless paid out of Federal funds (sec. 1726.04, amended by Act 108, 1945).

Income tax deferment.—Payment may be deferred 6 months after discharge, without interest charge (sec. 5518).

Income-tax exemptions.—Compensation in armed services exempt (sec 5506).

Loans.—Certain financial institutions authorized make loans secured by real property on guarantee of Administrator of Veterans' Affairs (sec. 8438, amended 1945, Act 223).

Reemployment, government.—No loss or diminution of vacation, holidays, promotions, because of military leave; may apply for reemployment within 40 days after discharge and shall be restored without loss of seniority to position of like status at prevailing pay (person in position dismissed and placed on reemployment list), in same bracket as if he had served continuously and maintained efficiency standards. Merchant marine and civilian service without pay for armed forces included in rights (secs. 555-558, 125.02, Acts 114, 184, 263, 1945).

Retirement system, government.—Service credit given and contributions made while in service, rights defined specifically (secs. 719-721).

Unemployment compensation benefits.—Benefit credits "frozen" to June 30, 1947, to protect rights (secs. 4218-4225, amended 1945, Act 19).

VFW property tax exemption granted by Act 234, Laws 1945, amended section 5151.

Vocational rehabilitation.—Territorial program, in cooperation with Federal agencies, for disabled persons; cooperating agreement with workmen's compensation bureau provided (secs. 1894-1898, amended 1945, Act 117).

EXHIBIT 11B. PRESENTED BY THE HAWAII EQUAL RIGHTS COMMISSION

HAWAII CHILD-LABOR LAW, AS OF APRIL 9, 1945

AGE

All under 18:

Employer must obtain certificate from department of labor and industrial relations.

Regular: Permitting employment during school hours.

Vacation: Permitting employment when not legally required to attend school.

EXCEPT—

(No certificates required for following)

Any minor employed:

When performed directly for parents or guardians in agricultural labor or any work (other than hazardous) when not legally required to attend school.

Sale or distribution of newspapers,

Domestic service,

United States or the Territory of Hawaii or any political subdivision thereof.

Over 16 years: Agricultural labor (for others than parents or guardian) when not legally required to attend school.

CERTIFICATES COVER FOLLOWING

Age	Work permitted	Work prohibited
12 to 14.....	When not legally required to attend School; <i>provided</i> , not more than 6 consecutive days in 1 week; not more than 6 hours in 1 day; not before 7 a. m. or after 6 p. m.; combined work and school hours not exceeding total of 9 hours per day; not more than 30 hours in any 1 week; not more than 5 hours continuously without 30 minutes lunch period. ¹	When legally required to attend school. Work in a gainful occupation prohibited by law; work in, about, or in connection with power-driven machinery. Work declared by commission of labor and industrial relations to be hazardous or detrimental to life, safety, or well-being.
14 to 16.....	Same as 12 to 14 above except permitted 8 hours per day and 40 per week when not legally required to attend school.	Same prohibitions that apply to 12 to 14 age group.
16 to 18.....	Work at any time (includes work with machinery) except (see prohibited work).	Work declared by commission to be hazardous or detrimental to life, health, safety, or well-being.

¹ Commission rule—minors in agricultural labor may start at 6 a. m.

NOTE.—Employment certificates issued by the Department are acceptable as proof of age under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 and as work permits under the Walsh-Healey Act. The Department will not knowingly issue a certificate contrary to the provisions of any Federal law.

Source: Department of Labor and Industrial Relations, Territory of Hawaii.

EXHIBIT 11c. PRESENTED BY THE HAWAII EQUAL RIGHTS COMMISSION

Social Security Board, Form UC-209A

Unemployment compensation coverage—Report on total number of reporting units, by major industry groups, January 1938 and September 1945

(Reported by: Territory of Hawaii. Agency: Unemployment compensation board)

Industry groups	January 1938	September 1945
'Total for all industries.....	4, 327	6, 442
Agriculture, forestry, and fishing:		
07. Agricultural and similar service establishments.....	10	8
Mining and quarrying:		
14. Nonmetallic mining and quarrying.....	3	4
Contract construction:		
15. General contractors-building construction.....	133	179
16. General contractors, other than building construction.....	11	13
17. Special trade contractors (subcontractors).....	170	218
Manufacturing:		
20. Food manufacturing.....	208	194
22. Textile mill products.....	3	4
23. Apparel and other finished articles made from fabrics.....	15	51
24. Basic lumber industries.....	1	4
25. Finished lumber products.....	19	27
26. Paper and allied products.....	3	5
27. Printing, publishing and allied industries.....	48	53
28. Chemicals.....	6	19
29. Products of petroleum and coal.....	—	1
30. Rubber products.....	—	5
31. Leather and its manufactures.....	3	8
32. Stone, clay and glass products.....	2	5
33. Iron and steel and their products.....	8	5
34. Transportation equipment (except automobiles).....	—	10
35. Nonferrous metals and their products.....	2	3
37. Machinery other than electrical.....	—	2
38. Automobiles, bodies and parts.....	—	3
39. Miscellaneous manufacturing.....	12	10

Unemployment compensation coverage—Report on total number of reporting units, by major industry groups, January 1938 and September 1945—Cont.

Industry groups	January 1938	September 1945
Transportation, communication, and utilities:		
40, 41. Interstate railroads, local railways and bus lines	9	8
42. Trucking and/or warehousing for hire	48	90
43. Other transportation, except water transportation	53	148
44. Water transportation	5	6
45. Services added to transportation, not elsewhere classified	9	12
46. Communications—telephone, telegraph, commercial radio, and related services	6	6
48. Utilities—light, heat, and power companies, electric and gas	12	12
49. Other local utilities and local public services	6	7
Wholesale and retail trade:		
50. Wholesale merchants	86	184
51. Wholesale distributors other than wholesale merchants	151	139
52. Wholesale and retail trade combined	209	33
53. Retail general merchandise	300	306
54. Retail food	264	570
55. Retail automotive	47	43
56. Retail apparel	219	221
57. Retail trade, not elsewhere classified	261	456
58. Eating and drinking places	409	942
59. Retail filling stations		115
Finance, insurance, and real estate:		
60. Banks and trust companies	13	15
61. Investment banking and security speculation	15	7
62. Finance agencies not elsewhere classified	34	31
63. Insurance carriers	7	14
64. Insurance agents and brokers	13	22
65. Real-estate dealers, agents, and brokers	237	247
66. Real estate, insurance, loans, law office, and combination	16	18
67. Administrative offices and holding companies	3	2
Service:		
70. Hotels, furnished rooms, camps, and other lodging places	90	114
72. Personal service	306	694
73. Business service, not elsewhere classified	109	135
74. Employment agencies and commercial and trade schools	9	16
75. Automobile repair services, garages, and filling stations	216	110
76. Repair services and miscellaneous hand trades, not elsewhere classified	38	77
78. Amusement and recreation—motion pictures	34	41
79. Amusement and recreation and related services, not elsewhere classified	49	198
80. Medical and other health services	220	264
81. Law offices and related services	57	48
82. Educational institutions and agencies	13	50
83. Other professional and social-service agencies and institutions	22	104
86. Membership organizations such as trade associations, trade-unions, etc.	66	103
Establishments, not elsewhere classified:		
99. Private business organizations, not elsewhere classified	1	
List any others not included above:		
90. Plantation agencies	6	

EXHIBIT 11D. PRESENTED BY THE HAWAII EQUAL RIGHTS COMMISSION

Average monthly number of workers covered by Hawaii unemployment-compensation law

Major industry group	1939	1942	1945 (January-September)
All industries	73, 285	99, 978	77, 020
Agriculture, forestry, fishing (industrial employees)	73	42	52
Mining, quarrying	37	226	363
Construction	5, 311	36, 712	5, 620
Manufacturing (including pineapple and sugar industrial employees)	34, 791	24, 889	24, 880
Transportation, utilities, and communication	7, 087	9, 573	9, 483
Wholesale, retail trade	17, 943	19, 519	22, 164
Finance, insurance, real estate	1, 771	2, 031	2, 231
Services	6, 241	6, 979	12, 222
Establishments not elsewhere classified	31	7	5

Source: Department of Labor and Industrial Relations, Territory of Hawaii.

EXHIBIT 11E. PRESENTED BY THE HAWAII EQUAL RIGHTS COMMISSION

Average weekly wages, workers covered by Hawaii unemployment-compensation law

(See also exhibits 11g and 94 relating to labor in the sugar industry and exhibits 11h and 79b relating to labor in the pineapple industry)

Major industry group	1939	1940	1941	1942	1943	1944	1945, Jan-Sept.
All industries.....	\$18.65	\$23.25	\$26.31	\$37.33	\$40.54	\$41.35	\$41.64
Agriculture, forestry, fishing (industrial employees).....	10.06	11.56	13.48	18.44	26.21	26.88	28.77
Mining, quarrying.....	15.45	18.65	32.67	41.56	44.23	57.17	58.82
Construction.....	19.73	24.40	31.48	46.94	58.67	57.40	57.97
Manufacturing (including pineapple and sugar industrial employees).....	13.91	21.12	21.23	27.96	33.86	36.90	39.51
Transportation, utilities, and communication.....	27.58	30.40	34.92	42.15	46.98	52.44	52.95
Wholesale, retail trade.....	22.34	22.79	25.48	32.75	36.90	39.73	38.44
Finance, insurance, real estate.....	34.52	35.62	37.92	41.25	47.58	52.40	52.33
Services.....	19.06	19.19	20.10	25.10	28.92	32.60	33.05
Establishments, not elsewhere classified.....	14.02	5.02	38.56	25.06	26.69	19.98	20.38

Source: Department of Labor and Industrial Relations, Territory of Hawaii.

EXHIBIT 11F. PRESENTED BY THE HAWAII EQUAL RIGHTS COMMISSION

Comparative average weekly wages, industrial workers, Hawaii and mainland, United States of America, 1940 and 1945

(See also exhibit 79A relating to labor in the pineapple industry)

Industry group ¹	1940		1945	
	Hawaii, April-May-June ²	Mainland, June ³	Hawaii, July-August-September ⁴	Mainland, August ⁵
Manufacturing:				
Food and kindred products.....	\$12.94	\$25.54	\$40.31	\$38.13
Textiles and their products.....	14.20	16.43	27.23	29.64
Apparel.....	15.56	16.96	29.46	27.93
Lumber and allied products.....	29.07	22.02	47.92	33.07
Furniture.....	24.20	20.67	45.69	34.11
Paper.....	26.86	21.99	44.38	38.70
Printing and publishing.....	25.28	30.59	51.08	46.70
Chemicals and allied.....	26.94	38.21	56.15	43.41
Petroleum, coal products.....		34.84	62.46	56.97
Rubber.....	21.46	28.27	46.31	46.76
Leather and its manufactures.....	11.08	18.17	18.31	33.62
Stone, clay, glass products.....	22.20	24.20	37.77	38.96
Iron, steel (excluding machinery).....	30.86	29.30	40.08	46.14
Transportation equipment, excluding autos.....		34.32	59.08	54.28
Nonferrous metals and products.....	21.20	27.25	56.38	46.01
Machinery (excluding transportation equipment and electrical).....		30.41	48.54	48.55
Automobiles.....	17.31	35.47	39.85	41.42
Miscellaneous.....	17.42		40.92	40.94
Nonmanufacturing:				
Street railways, busses.....	24.94	33.62	49.85	51.59
Communication.....	30.59	31.18	50.38	43.44
Electricity and gas, Hawaii.....	30.61	35.10	56.62	50.71
Electricity, mainland.....				
Wholesale trade.....	25.46	30.61	52.92	43.27
Retail, general merchandise.....	13.59	18.21	27.54	23.91
Retail, food and liquor.....	14.67	23.66	33.38	34.68
Retail, automotive.....	26.91	28.54	46.31	42.58
Retail, apparel.....	16.71	21.23	37.62	29.99
Hotels (cash wages only).....	16.50	15.49	34.77	24.37
Brokerage (security, investments).....	35.13	37.24	66.69	59.10
Insurance agents, Hawaii.....	34.02	36.75	52.85	46.73
Insurance, general, mainland.....				
Building construction, general.....				
Quarrying, nonmetallic mining.....	21.81	22.65	61.54	41.25

¹ Incomplete list, comparisons were possible only between classifications shown in both Hawaii and mainland reports.² Source: Bureau of Unemployment Compensation Quarterly Report, September 1940.³ Source: Monthly Labor Review, September 1940.⁴ Source: Bureau of Unemployment Compensation Quarterly Report, November 1945.⁵ Source: Monthly Labor Review, November 1945.

EXHIBIT 11G. PRESENTED BY THE HAWAII EQUAL RIGHTS COMMISSION

DATA ON THE HAWAIIAN SUGAR INDUSTRY

(Figures submitted by Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association)

There are 35 sugar companies operating in the Territory, with a total capitalization of approximately \$175,000,000. Approximately 16,000 persons own stock in these companies, dividends from which totaled approximately \$6,036,845 in 1945. The total pay roll for the industry in 1945 was approximately \$37,500,000.

LAND

There are about 216,000 acres in the Territory planted in sugarcane. Approximately half of this land is owned by the plantations; the rest is leased from estates, from the Territorial government and from individuals.

RESEARCH

Amounts spent during 1945 on scientific research, agricultural engineering, and sugar research foundation, approximately \$678,000.

LABOR

A standard 8-hour day is in effect throughout the entire industry. All hours over 8 hours per day or over 48 hours per week are paid for at 1½ times the employee's applicable rate. During the first 6 months of 1945, unskilled labor received an average cash wage of \$4.26 per day; for July, August, September, and October of 1945 wages averaged \$5.11 cash per day for unskilled labor. In addition, employees received complete medical care, housing, fuel, lights, and water for themselves and for the immediate members of their families.

Citizenship and racial descent of employees

	Citizens	Non-citizens	Total
Anglo-Saxon.....	687	20	687
Japanese.....	5,008	3,656	8,664
Filipino.....	364	9,746	10,110
Chinese.....	106	51	157
Puerto Rican.....	507	3	510
Portuguese.....	1,689	64	1,753
Hawaiian.....	478		478
All others.....	77	158	235
Total adult males.....	8,896	13,698	22,594
Total adult females.....	1,230	716	1,946
Total children (part time).....	4,014	3	4,017
Grand total.....	14,140	14,417	28,557

EXHIBIT 11H. PRESENTED BY THE HAWAII EQUAL RIGHTS COMMISSION

Data on the pineapple industry in Hawaii

(Figures submitted by the Pineapple Growers Association of Hawaii)

Number of companies and plantations.—Eight companies operate 12 plantations and 9 canneries, as follows:

	Plantations	Canneries
(1) Hawaiian Pineapple Co.....	2	1
(2) Libby, McNeill & Libby.....	3	2
(3) California Packing Corp.....	2	1
(4) Maui Pineapple Co.....	1	1
(5) Kauai Pineapple Co.....	1	1
(6) Baldwin Packers, Ltd.....	1	1
(7) Hawaiian Canners Co. (Kauai).....	1	1
(8) Hawaiian Fruit Packers, Ltd.....	1	1

¹ Associated with Alexander & Baldwin, Ltd.

² Associated with American Factors, Ltd.

Arable land utilized for pineapple production, including roadways and camp sites, but excluding ravines or other nonusable areas, approximately 62,677 acres, of which about 33 percent is owned in fee simple by the companies, 60.9 percent is leased from various estates, a small area is leased from the Government. The balance covers the acreage grown on homestead land and that of independent growers.

Amount spent annually on research by the Pineapple Research Institute of Hawaii and the various pineapple companies of the Pineapple Growers Association of Hawaii, approximately \$945,000.

Hourly wage and citizenship of labor

	Male (minimum)	Male (average)	Female (minimum)	Female (average)
	Cents	Cents	Cents	Cents
Honolulu canneries.....	70	94.76	60	69.61
Canneries on islands other than Oahu.....	55 to 70	79.76	49.5 to 60	62.12
Plantations ¹	54 to 55	69.94	45 to 55	55.00

¹ These figures are actually payments, no consideration being given to the value of perquisites (housing, water, fuel, lights, and full medical attention), which are supplied without cost to the laborers.

The average number of employees in the Honolulu canneries (Oahu) during the month of November 1945 was 2,632, of whom 68.84 percent are citizens.

The average number in the canneries on islands other than Oahu during the same period for which this data is given was 1,122, of whom 62.39 percent are citizens.

It will be noted that the period for which this data is given excludes the large harvesting season from June to September, when large numbers of students and extra people are employed.

EXHIBIT 111. PRESENTED BY THE HAWAII EQUAL RIGHTS COMMISSION

Maximum weekly and annual unemployment benefits, maximum duration of benefits, and qualifying wages for maximum benefits, by State, June 30, 1945¹

State	Maximum weekly benefit	Maximum weeks of benefits for total unemployment	Maximum annual benefits	Qualifying wages for maximum benefits ²			
				High quarter		Base period	
				Amount	Fraction	Amount	Fraction
Alabama.....	\$20	20	\$400.00	\$507.01	$\frac{1}{2}$	\$1,200.00	$\frac{1}{2}$
Alaska ³	16	16	256.00	300.01	$\frac{1}{2}$	768.00	$\frac{1}{2}$
Arizona ³	15	14	210.00	364.01	$\frac{1}{2}$	1,260.00	$\frac{1}{2}$
Arkansas ³	15	16	240.00	377.01	$\frac{1}{2}$	\$ 754.02	$\frac{1}{2}$
California ²	⁶ 20	⁶ 23.4	⁶ 468.00	{ 380.00- 500.00 }	$\frac{1}{2}$	2,000.00	(?)
Colorado ³	⁸ 15	16	240.00	371.88	$\frac{1}{2}$	720.00	$\frac{1}{2}$
Connecticut.....	22-28	⁶ 20	{ ⁶ 440.00- 560.00 }	559.00	$\frac{1}{2}$	1,720.00	$\frac{3}{4}$ +
Delaware.....	18	22	396.00	437.51	$\frac{1}{2}$	1,584.00	$\frac{1}{4}$
District of Columbia ³	⁶ 20	20	⁶ 400.00	437.01	$\frac{1}{2}$	800.00	$\frac{1}{2}$
Florida ³	15	16	240.00	360.01	$\frac{1}{2}$ - $\frac{1}{2}$	960.00	$\frac{1}{4}$
Georgia ³	18	16	288.00	455.01	$\frac{1}{2}$ - $\frac{1}{2}$	¹⁰ 720.00	(11)
Hawaii.....	25	20	500.00	600.01	$\frac{1}{2}$	¹⁰ 750.00	(11)
Idaho ³	18	17	306.00	585.01	$\frac{1}{2}$ - $\frac{1}{2}$	1,224.00	$\frac{1}{4}$
Illinois.....	20	26	520.00	390.01	$\frac{1}{2}$	1,575.00	(?)
Indiana.....	20	20	400.00	475.01	$\frac{1}{2}$	1,600.00	$\frac{1}{4}$
Iowa.....	18	18	324.00	414.00	$\frac{1}{2}$	972.00	$\frac{1}{2}$
Kansas.....	16	20	320.00	375.01	$\frac{1}{2}$	960.00	$\frac{1}{2}$
Kentucky ¹²	16	20	320.00	¹³ 398.75	(13)	1,595.00	(11)
Louisiana ¹²	18	20	360.00	425.01	$\frac{1}{2}$	1,440.00	$\frac{1}{4}$
Maine.....	⁶ 20	20	⁶ 400.00	¹³ 500.00	(13)	2,000.00	(11)
Maryland ¹⁴	20	26	520.00	{ 380.01- 520.00 }	$\frac{1}{2}$	2,080.00	$\frac{1}{4}$
Massachusetts ¹⁵	⁶ 21	23	⁶ 483.00	400.00	$\frac{1}{2}$	1,610.00	$\frac{3}{4}$
Michigan.....	¹⁶ 20-28	20	{ ¹⁶ 400.00- 560.00 }	390.01- 560.00	$\frac{1}{2}$	2,240.00	¹⁷ $\frac{3}{4}$
Minnesota.....	20	20	400.00	¹³ 437.50	(13)	1,750.00	(?)
Mississippi ¹⁶	15	14	210.00	364.01	$\frac{1}{2}$	¹⁰ 450.00	(11)
Missouri ³	18	16	288.00	437.51	$\frac{1}{2}$	1,440.00	$\frac{1}{4}$
Montana ³	15	16	240.00	350.01	$\frac{1}{2}$	¹⁰ 450.00	(11)
Nebraska.....	18	18	324.00	425.01	$\frac{1}{2}$	972.00	$\frac{1}{4}$

*Maximum weekly and annual unemployment benefits, maximum duration of benefits, and qualifying wages for maximum benefits, by State, June 30, 1945*¹—
Continued

State	Maximum weekly benefit	Maximum weeks of benefits for total unemployment	Maximum annual benefits	Qualifying wages for maximum benefits ²			
				High quarter		Base period	
				Amount	Fraction	Amount	Fraction
Nevada	^{6 18} \$18-24	¹⁸ 20-15	^{6 18} \$360.00	\$340.01	$\frac{1}{10}$	\$1,080.00	$\frac{1}{4}$
New Hampshire	^{6 20} 20	^{6 20} 20	^{6 20} 400.00	¹⁸ 500.00	(¹¹)	2,000.00	(¹¹)
New Jersey	22	26	572.00	462.01	$\frac{1}{2}$	1,716.00	$\frac{1}{4}$
New Mexico ³	15	16	240.00	377.01	$\frac{1}{6}$	720.00	$\frac{1}{4}$
New York	^{19 21} 21	^{19 26} 26	546.00	471.00	$\frac{1}{4}$	10,620.00	(¹¹)
North Carolina	20	^{30 16} 16	320.00	¹⁸ 520.00	(¹³)	2,080.00	(¹¹)
North Dakota	20	20	400.00	437.01	$\frac{1}{2}$	10,560.00	(¹¹)
Ohio ¹⁴	^{6 21} 21	^{6 22} 22	^{6 462.00} 462.00	581.00	$\frac{1}{2}$	²¹ 1,117.31	(²³)
Oklahoma	18	20	360.00	340.01	$\frac{1}{2}$	1,080.00	$\frac{1}{4}$
Oregon	^{6 18} 18	^{6 20} 20	^{6 360.00} 360.00	¹⁸ 360.00	(¹¹)	1,440.00	(¹¹)
Pennsylvania	^{6 20} 20	^{6 20} 20	^{6 400.00} 400.00	488.00	$\frac{1}{2}$	1,366.00	(¹¹)
Rhode Island ⁵	^{6 18} 18	^{6 20.25} 20.25	^{6 364.50} 364.50	$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} 315.00- \\ 450.00 \end{array} \right\}$	$\frac{1}{16}-\frac{1}{10}$	1,800.00	(¹¹)
South Carolina	^{6 20} 20	^{6 16} 16	^{6 320.00} 320.00	494.01	$\frac{1}{2}$	10,800.00	(¹¹)
South Dakota	15	20	300.00	325.00	$\frac{1}{2}$	1,300.00	(¹¹)
Tennessee ⁶	15	16	240.00	364.01	$\frac{1}{2}$	10,450.00	(¹¹)
Texas	^{19 18} 18	^{19 18} 18	324.00	455.01	$\frac{1}{2}$	1,620.00	$\frac{1}{4}$
Utah	^{28 17-25} 17-25	^{28 27.0-18.4} 27.0-18.4	460.00	380.01	$\frac{1}{2}$	10,600.00	(²⁸)
Vermont	20	20	400.00	500.00	$\frac{1}{2}$	10,000.00	(¹¹)
Virginia ¹²	15	16	240.00	350.01	$\frac{1}{2}$	930.01	$\frac{1}{4}$
Washington	25	26	650.00	¹⁸ 550.00	(¹³)	2,200.00	(¹¹)
West Virginia	20	21	420.00	¹⁸ 450.00	(¹³)	1,800.00	(¹¹)
Wisconsin ^{15 24}	20	23	460.00	520.01	(²⁴)	1,840.01	$\frac{1}{2}$
Wyoming	20	20	400.00	390.01	$\frac{1}{2}$	²⁸ 1,560.01	$\frac{1}{4}$

¹ The text footnote 2 for dates when 1945 amendments are effective.

² The amount of high-quarter wages required for the maximum benefit amount varies with the rounding provision as well as with the fraction of high-quarter wages. Rounding is indicated by odd cents regardless of State practice in adding or dropping cents. When 2 amounts are given, the higher amount is required for maximum duration at maximum weekly benefits; the lower amount for maximum weekly benefits. In statement of maximum base-period qualifying wages, rounding of benefit duration to dollar amounts is ignored. Odd amounts given are from tables of duration. The fraction of high-quarter wages applied between the minimum and maximum amounts. Where the State law utilizes a weighted table for the benefit formula, the fractions are approximate. Where dependents' allowances are provided, the fraction applies to the basic benefit.

³ No change in 1945.

⁴ 8-quarter base period, extended through the next to last completed calendar quarter prior to any week of benefits in Arizona.

⁵ For maximum duration, requires in each quarter of the base period wages equal to $\frac{1}{4}$ wages in the high quarter.

⁶ Contains provision for reduction if solvency of fund is imperiled.

⁷ Maximum potential benefits according to table of base-period earnings.

⁸ \$22 maximum basic benefit plus \$2 per dependent up to 3.

⁹ Same maximum with or without dependents; below maximum, weekly benefits equal $\frac{1}{3}$ of high-quarter wages plus \$1 for each of not more than 3 dependents and annual benefits may be increased accordingly.

¹⁰ The potential duration is uniform for all eligible claimants, and the only requirement for base-period wages is a multiple of the weekly benefit amount specified in the eligibility provision, as 30 in Georgia. See table 7 for formula for qualifying wage.

¹¹ Uniform.

¹² No session in 1945.

¹³ Utilizes annual rather than high-quarter formula; amount shown is $\frac{1}{4}$ of the annual wage required.

¹⁴ Law provides for increase of maximum weekly benefit amount to \$25, based on \$480.01 high-quarter and at least \$750 base-period wages, in event of similar increase in veterans' readjustment allowances.

¹⁵ Legislature still in session. Wisconsin recessed until September.

¹⁶ \$20 maximum basic benefit plus \$2 per dependent up to the lesser of \$28 and average weekly wage in high quarter.

¹⁷ But \$200, or 30 percent of base-period wages, whichever is the lesser, if base-period wages are \$250-\$800.

¹⁸ Dependents' allowances of \$3 for first 1 or 2 dependents and \$6 for 3 or more will not increase maximum annual benefits and hence will decrease weeks of benefits for claimants with dependents.

¹⁹ Converted from days of unemployment in New York and 2-week periods in Texas.

²⁰ 20 weeks for veterans under "freezing provisions."

²¹ For 25 calendar weeks if high quarter was 13 calendar weeks of employment.

²² 18 weeks' duration for those employed 20 calendar weeks in base period; 19 weeks' duration for those employed 21-24; 22 weeks for those employed more than 24.

²³ Weekly benefit amounts adjusted with cost of living index; statutory maximum \$20 reduced 20 percent when index is 98.5 or below, increased 20 percent when index is at or above 125; maximum annual benefits not affected; therefore if weekly amount is decreased or increased, weeks increased or decreased from normal uniform duration of 23 weeks.

²⁴ Requirements are in terms of average wages with the employer whose account is being charged. Figures given are based on an "average wage" of \$40.01 or more and all earnings specified from 1 employer, and duration in terms of 1 week of benefits for 2 of employment with the employer, maximum 23.

²⁵ Fraction of base-period wages rounded to nearest \$20.

Source: Table 1, State Unemployment Compensation Laws of 1945, Social Security Bulletin, July 1945.

EXHIBIT 11M. PRESENTED BY THE HAWAII EQUAL RIGHTS COMMITTEE

Minimum weekly benefits and qualifying wages therefor, and potential annual benefits and duration of benefits for claimants who meet minimum qualifying requirements, by State, June 30, 1945¹

State	Minimum weekly benefit	Minimum weeks of benefits for total unemployment	Potential annual benefits	Qualifying wages for minimum benefits ²		
				High quarter	Base period	Formula
Alabama.....	\$4	10	\$40.00	\$75.01	\$120.00	30X
Alaska ³	5	8+	42.00	31.25	125.00	25X
Arizona ⁴	5	2+	12.00	23.33	70.00	14X
Arkansas ⁵	3	4	12.00	16.50	66.00	22X
California ⁶	10	16	160.00	75.00	300.00	Flat
Colorado ⁷	5	10	50.00	37.50	150.00	30X
Connecticut.....	8-12	7+8	70.00	60.00	240.00	Flat
Delaware.....	7	11	77.00	52.50	210.00	30X
District of Columbia ⁸	10-6-9	7 12+	75.00	37.50	150.00	11 25X
Florida ⁹	5	7+	37.50	37.50	150.00	30X
Georgia ¹⁰	4	12 16	64.00	48.00	100.00	25-40X
Hawaii ¹¹	5	12 20	100.00	37.50	150.00	30X
Idaho ¹²	5	7	35.00	78.00	140.00	28-62X
Illinois ¹³	10	7 12+	125.00	56.25	225.00	Flat
Indiana ¹⁴	5	7 12+	62.00	75.00	250.00	Flat
Iowa.....	5	6	30.00	22.50	90.00	18X
Kansas ¹⁵	5	6+	34.00	50.00	100.00	15 Flat
Kentucky.....	5	12 20	100.00	50.00	200.00	Flat
Louisiana ¹⁶	3	7+	23.00	22.50	90.00	30X
Maine.....	5	12 20	100.00	50.00	200.00	Flat
Maryland ¹⁷	7	7+	53.00	52.50	210.00	30X
Massachusetts ¹⁸	6	7+	45.00	37.50	150.00	Flat
Michigan ¹⁹	18 4. 81	18 15+	75.00	62.50	250.00	19 Flat
Minnesota.....	7	12	84.00	50.00	200.00	Flat
Mississippi ²⁰	3	12 14	42.00	22.50	90.00	30X
Missouri ²¹	20 3	1+	4.00	5.00	20.00	40X
Montana ²²	5	12 16	80.00	37.50	150.00	30X
Nebraska ²³	5	7 13+	67.00	50.00	200.00	Flat
Nevada.....	6 8-14	7+	59.00	43.75	175.00	21 25-30X
New Hampshire.....	6	12 20	120.00	50.00	200.00	Flat
New Jersey.....	9	10	90.00	37.50	150.00	Flat
New Mexico ²⁴	5	10	50.00	78.00	150.00	30X
New York.....	22 10	12 26	260.00	100.00	300.00	30X
North Carolina.....	4	12 16	64.00	32.50	130.00	Flat
North Dakota.....	5	12 20	100.00	35.00	140.00	28X
Ohio ²⁵	5	6 18	90.00	40.00	160.00	Flat
Oklahoma.....	6	6+	40.00	30.00	120.00	20X
Oregon.....	6 10	6 5	50.00	50.00	200.00	Flat
Pennsylvania.....	6 8	6 9	72.00	60.00	240.00	30X
Rhode Island ²⁶	6 6. 75	7 5+	34.00	25.00	100.00	Flat
South Carolina ²⁷	6 4	6 12 16	64.00	30.00	120.00	30-40X
South Dakota.....	6	7 10	60.00	60.00	125.00	Flat
Tennessee ²⁸	5	12 16	80.00	50.00	125.00	25-30X
Texas.....	22 5	3+	18.00	22.50	90.00	22 18X
Utah.....	24 5-7	23-16+	115.00	37.50	150.00	30X
Vermont.....	6	12 20	120.00	50.00	180.00	30X
Virginia ²⁹	4	6	24.00	25.00	100.00	25X
Washington.....	10	12	120.00	75.00	300.00	Flat
West Virginia.....	8	12 21	168.00	75.00	300.00	Flat
Wisconsin ³⁰	25 8	7 5+	42.00	(25)	105.14	(25)
Wyoming.....	7	5+	40.00	70.00	175.00	25X

¹ See text footnote 2 for dates when 1945 amendments are effective.

² Where high-quarter wages are not specified in the law, base-period wages are divided by the number of quarters in which they must be earned. Formula in terms of multiple of weekly benefit amount indicated. See table 1 for high-quarter formula.

³ No change in 1945.

⁴ Qualifying wages must have been earned in last 3 quarters of 8-quarter base period.

⁵ Duration is 4 weeks for each quarter of the 4-quarter base period in which the claimant's wages are equal to at least $\frac{1}{2}$ his high-quarter wages. Therefore, the potential annual benefits, if all or the largest part of the qualifying wage was earned in 1 quarter, are \$12. If $\frac{1}{2}$ high-quarter wages were earned in each other quarter the total potential benefits would be $\frac{1}{2}$ of the qualifying amount of \$22.

⁶ Contains provision for reduction if solvency of fund is imperiled.

⁷ If the qualifying wages are concentrated largely or wholly in the high quarter, the weekly benefit may be higher than the minimum and the weeks of benefits for claimant with minimum qualifying wages may be reduced accordingly. In Illinois not less than 10 weeks by statute.

⁸ For claimants with primary benefit only, increased with dependents' benefits.

⁹ \$200 if 75 percent of an individual's wages are in seasonal industry, i. e., in first processing of agricultural products; such individual's benefits are not payable during period November through April.

¹⁰ Weekly benefits may be increased \$1 for each dependent of specified types up to 3.

¹¹ 25 times up to weekly benefit of \$10; above that amount, flat \$250.

EXHIBIT 110. PRESENTED BY THE HAWAII EQUAL RIGHTS COMMISSION

HAWAII LABOR ORGANIZATIONS, DECEMBER 1945

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR

Territorial representative: John A. Owens, McCandless Building, Honolulu.
 Building and Construction Trades Council, McCandless Building, Honolulu.
 Central Labor Council, 50 South Queen Street, Honolulu.
 Metal Trades Council, McCandless Building, Honolulu.

A. F. of L.—Oahu:

Asbestos workers, heat and frost insulators, international association of; local 100.
 Boilermakers, iron shipbuilders and helpers of America, international brotherhood; local 204.
 Bricklayers, masons and plasterers, international union; local 1.
 Brewery workers union of Honolulu and vicinity; local 22052.
 Bridge, structural and ornamental iron workers, international association; local 625.
 Carpenters and joiners of America, United brotherhood; local 745.
 Dairy workers union of Hawaii; local 946.
 Electrical workers, international brotherhood; locals B-1186, B-1260, B-1357.
 Engineers, architects and draftsmen, international federation of; local 121.
 Engineers, operating, international union; local 635.
 Gasoline and oil drivers, warehousemen and helpers; local 904.
 Government employees, American federation of; local 882.
 Hod carriers, building and common laborers; local 533.
 Hotel, restaurant employees and bartenders union; local 5.
 Lathers, wood, wire and metal, international unions; local 491.
 Letter carriers, national association of; local 860.
 Machinists, international association of; local 1245.
 Marine equipment, maintenance and repair workers; local 23406.
 Masters, mates and pilots of America; local 21 and apprentices, local 7.
 Musicians association of Honolulu (American Federation of); local 677.
 Office employees, international union; local 170.
 Painters, decorators and paperhangers of America, brotherhood; local 1493.
 Plasterers and cement finishers, operative, international association; local 630.
 Plumbers and fitters, united association; local 675.
 Post office clerks, national federation; local 162.
 Roofers (tile and composition), damp and waterproof workers; local 227.
 Sailors union of the Pacific, Honolulu branch.
 Sailors union, inter-island; local 23406.

¹³ Potential duration of benefits is uniform for all eligible claimants.

¹⁴ Rounded to next lower dollar.

¹⁵ Including \$150 in last 2 quarters of base period.

¹⁶ Wages totaling \$100 in 2 quarters or \$200 in base period.

¹⁷ No session in 1945.

¹⁸ State legislature still in session. Wisconsin recessed to September.

¹⁹ Weekly benefit amount is average weekly wage in high quarter if less than \$10. With minimum high-quarter wages necessary to qualify, weekly benefit amount would be \$4.81. Minimum duration is 30 percent of base-period earnings but not less than 12 weeks. Amendments effective Apr. 1, 1945, add dependents' benefits up to the average weekly wage—hence would not affect the claimant at the minimum.

²⁰ Including some wages in at least 2 quarters.

²¹ Minimum weekly benefit is 50 cents, but if less than \$3, total benefits are paid at rate of \$3 per week. Qualifying earnings are 40 times weekly benefit amount in 8-quarter base period, including some earnings in at least 3 quarters.

²² \$175 if computed weekly benefit is less than \$8. 25-30 times weekly benefit amount if computed weekly benefit amount is more than \$8. Including earnings of 5 times the weekly benefit in some quarter other than the high quarter.

²³ Converted from days of unemployment in New York and 2-week periods in Texas.

²⁴ And employment in at least 20 weeks.

²⁵ Provision effective July 1, 1945, raises weekly benefit amount 20 percent to next higher dollar when cost-of-living index reaches 125; since total annual benefits are not increased, duration would be correspondingly decreased.

²⁶ Minimum benefit amount is \$6, but benefits are paid at rate of \$8 per week. 14 weeks of employment with 1 employer are needed to qualify, and benefits are in the ratio of 1 week for 2 weeks of employment. Average weekly wages of \$7.51 to \$9 qualify for the \$6 benefit. Wisconsin has no concept of "benefit year."

Seafarers of North America, international union, Honolulu branch.
 Stage employees and moving picture machine operators of United States and Canada; local 665.
 State, county and municipal employees, American federation; locals 577 and 813.
 Street, electric railway and motor coach employees of America (amalgamated association); local 1173.
 Taxi and bus drivers union; local 936.
 Teamsters, chauffeurs, warehousemen and helpers of America; international brotherhood; local 996.
 Typographical union, international; local 37.

A. F. of L.—Hawaii, Maui and Kauai:

Headquarters for Hawaii, Hilo Drug Building, Hilo, T. H.
 Electrical workers; locals NB-1414 and B-1357, unit 1, Hilo, T. H.
 Post office clerks, national federation; local 664, Hilo, T. H.
 Sugar workers union, Hilo, T. H.; local 23587.
 Electrical workers, locals NB-1437 and B-1357, unit 2, Wailuku, Maui.
 Electrical workers, local B-1357, unit 3, Lihue, Kauai.

CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS

Architects, engineers, chemists and technicians, international federation; Hawaii Chapter 37.

Communications association, American; local 13

Marine cooks and stewards association of Pacific coast, Honolulu branch.

Maritime union, national, Honolulu branch.

Office and professional workers, united (Honolulu); local 190.

State, county and municipal workers of America, National Teachers Division; local 653, Hawaii.

State, county and municipal workers of America; local 646, Hilo, Hawaii.

International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union:

Regional office, 829 Kaahumanu St., Honolulu: Jack W. Hall, regional director.

Territorial representative: 829 Kaahumanu St., Honolulu, Frank E. Thompson.

Iluw—Oahu (employees represented—companies covered):

Local No. 137: Castle & Cooke, clerks and shops; Castle & Cooke Terminals, stevedores; Inter-Island Steam Navigation; American Stevedoring; McCabe, Hamilton & Renny—stevedores.

Local No. 145, 7 units: Oahu Sugar; Ewa Plantation; Waianae Co.; Kahuku Plantation; Waimanalo Sugar; Honolulu Plantation; Waialua Agricultural Co.

Local No. 146: Oahu Railway & Land Co.

Local No. 150: American Can Co.; Hawaiian Tuna Packers; Inter-Island Steam Navigation (dry dock); Hawaiian Gas Products.

Local No. 152: Hawaiian Pineapple Co.; California Packing; Libby, McNeill, Libby.

Iluw—Hawaii (Headquarters, 1383 Kamehameha Avenue, Hilo):

Local No. 136, 7 units: Stevedores, railway wharf workers, clerks and checkers, warehouse and distributing workers (Hilo); Hawaiian Cane Products Co., Mana Transportation, Hilo Iron Works.

Local No. 140: Hawaii Consolidated Railway Co.

Local No. 141, 2 units: Hawaiian Agriculture Co.; Hutchinson Sugar Plantation.

Local No. 142, 5 units: Pepeekeo Sugar; Hilo Sugar; Honomu Sugar; Onomea Sugar; Hakalau Plant.

Local No. 143, 5 units: Hamakau Mill (sugar); Kaiwiki Sugar; Paauihan Sugar; Honokaa Sugar; Laupahoehoe Sugar.

Local No. 147: Kohala Sugar Co.

Local No. 148: Olaa Sugar Co.

Iluw—Maui, headquarters, box 1062, Wailuku, Maui (employees represented—companies covered):

Local No. 144, 11 units: Maui Agricultural; Hawaiian Commercial and Sugar; Wailuku Sugar; American Can Co.; Maui Pineapple; East Maui Irrigation; Libby, McNeill, Libby; Baldwin Packers; Pioneer Mill; Maui Soda and Ice; Kahului Railroad.

Iluu—Kauai (headquarters, box 589, Lihue, Kauai):

Local No. 149, 13 units: Lihue Plantation; Hawaiian Canneries; Koloa Sugar; Hawaiian Fruit Packers; American Can Co.; Kilauea Sugar; Kauai Pineapple; Grove Farm (sugar); Kekaha Sugar; Olokele Sugar; von-Hamm Young; Nawiliwili Transportation; McBryde Sugar Co.

Local No. 135, 3 units: Kauai Terminal; Ahukini Terminal; American Factors (warehouse).

Iluu—Molokai: Local No. 151: California Packing Corp.; and Libby, McNeill & Libby.

INDEPENDENT UNIONS

Marine Engineers Beneficial Association, National; Local 100—Honolulu.

Marine Firemen, Oilers, Watertenders and Wipers, Pacific Coast, Honolulu Branch.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES ORGANIZATIONS

Federal Employees, National Federation of; Locals 127 and 716.

Hawaii Education Association.

Hawaiian Government Employees Association.

Oahu Education Association.

Number of units

A. F. of L.....	46
CIO.....	68
Independent.....	2
Government employees.....	5
Total	121

EXHIBIT 11P. PRESENTED BY THE HAWAII EQUAL RIGHTS COMMISSION

Hawaii labor disputes and strikes, 1940-45

(Territory of Hawaii, Department of Labor and Industrial Relations, Bureau of Research and Statistics, Honolulu 16, T. H.)

Date	Industry	Union	Workers involved	Man-days lost	Issues stated in press and other sources
<i>1940</i>					
February	Agriculture, sugar	Cannery Workers, CIO	1	0	Discrimination, 1 union member—mediation.
March	Service, restaurant	Culinary and Bartenders, AFL	40	0	Discrimination, union members; classification, hours, and overtime pay—mediation.
June	Communication, radio	American Communication Association, CIO.	6	48	Sympathy with New York strike for union recognition.
July	Agriculture and stevedoring	International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, CIO.	232	32,944	Wage policy for casual workers; claim lock-out.
September	Manufacturing, beverage	Brewery Union, independent; Brewery Union, AFL.	45	45 (?)	Interunion dispute on jurisdiction on contract.
November	Stevedoring	International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, CIO.	130	(?)	Protest discharge 4 men. ²
November	Manufacturing, dairy products	Dairy Workers, AFL	90	180	Discrimination, 1 union man; also union shop and wages.
Involved in strikes.			502	33,217 (?)	
<i>1941</i>					
January	Agriculture, stevedoring	I L W U, CIO	200	22,400	Pay policy for casuals, etc.; continuing strike, July 1940.
February	Transportation, local bus	S. E. R. and MMP, AFL	324	7,776	Union shop; work schedules, shop policies on retirement, uniforms, discharge, grievance procedures, uniforms and other.
April	Service, restaurant	Restaurant and Bartenders, AFL	8	8	Wage increases.
April	Water transport, and allied service	M. F. O. W. W., independent	202	732	Wage increases.
May	Construction, defense	Plumbers and Steam Fitters, AFL	81	182	Wage increases; 40 hours week, overtime scales.
May	Construction, defense	11 craft unions, AFL	100	100	Same as strike just above.
May	Construction, defense	Plumbers and Steam Fitters, AFL	(?)	(?)	Maximum workweek, mediation offer, settled by temporary agreement.
June	Construction, defense	No union involved	500	1,500	Pay increases, discrimination against local men, hours.
June	Service, restaurant	Restaurant and Bartenders, AFL	(?)	0	Abrogation union contract claimed, settled by mediation.
July	Territory of Hawaii Government	No union	30	15	Wage "freeze" by bureau budget.
Do	do	do	19	5	Do.

¹ Continued into 1941.² Men were out 7 days but impossible to figure exactly how much time lost, as shipping was rerouted.³ Same strike reported July 1940.⁴ Man involved and man-days not exact.

IISN strike caused idleness other dock workers.

Do	do	do	12	108	Wages; elimination piece rates; accident insurance, vacations; sex and race issues.
Do	City and county sewer department	do	12	24	Wage increase; better safety conditions (death of 1 man).
Do	Retail and repair, automobile	do	7	7	Wage increase.
October	Construction, defense	Tunnel, Sewer and Compressed Air, AFL	900	900	Wage increase; lunch and smoke time in air; physician, safety inspector.
Do	Water transportation, ditto	Cooks and Stewards, CIO MFOWW, CIO	115	345	Wage increases and closed shop, engine crews struck in sympathy.
Do	Water transportation	MFOWW, CIO	5	5	Refusal 1 man join union.
November	Manufacturing, milk	Dairy Workers, AFL	15	134	Closed shop refused by company.
December	Manufacturing, beverage	Brewery Workers, AFL	(?)	0	Recognition union and overtime pay.
Involved in strikes.			2,530	34,241	
1942					
March	Manufacturing, bakery	Teamsters, AFL	(?)	0	Wage decrease (threatened strike averted by conferences).
April	Territory of Hawaii Government	No union	42	39	Wage increase demanded.
September	Utility, electric	IBEW, AFL	(?)	0	Union recognition; impasse negotiations (mediation, March 1943).
October	Services, restaurant	No union	7	28	Protest discharge 1 man; race of supervising employee.
Involved in strikes.			49	67	
1943					
July	Transportation, local public	St. Elec. & M. C., AFL	(?)	(?)	Regulations and schedules, "slow down".
Do	Transportation, trucking	Teamsters, AFL	15	15	Discrimination union member; refusal permit organization.
August	Manufacturing, dairy	Dairy Workers, AFL	40	20	Wage increase; company refusal bargain on new contract.
Do	Manufacturing, bakery	Teamsters, AFL	(?)	0	Wage increase (conciliation).
September	Transportation, trucking	do	31	31	Discrimination union member and wage increases.
Do	Wholesale trade	do	116	650	Wage increase; impasse negotiations.
October	Manufacturing, fish	M. E. and D. W., independent	(?)	0	Wage increase; classification, union maintenance, seniority, etc. (OMG arbitration).
Involved in strikes.			202	716	
1944					
April	Manufacturing, dairy	Dairy Workers, AFL	6	60	Union recognition and wage issues.
1945					
April	Service restaurant	Hotel, Restaurant, Bartenders, AFL	18	270	Discrimination union member and wage issues.

[§] Brief "sit down."

[§] Company declared quit, not strike. NLRB decision March 1945 appealed.

Hawaii labor disputes and strikes, 1940-45—Continued

Date	Industry	Union	Workers involved	Man-days lost	Issues stated in press and other sources
June.....	Manufacturing, dairy.....	Dairy Workers, AFL.....	225	338	Wage decrease without consent WLB.
Do.....	Quarrying.....	Teamsters, AFL.....	125	500	Wage increase and refusal work overtime; retroactivity of contract.
August.....	Utility, electrical.....	I. B. E. W., AFL.....	10	10	Protest discharge 1 man.
Do.....	Utility, gas.....	G & O, W & H, AFL.....	170	405	Wage increase.
September.....	Wholesale trade.....	Teamsters, AFL.....	130	1,486	Company refusal arbitrate wages; increases and retroactivity.
Do.....	Manufacturing, dairy.....	Dairy Workers, AFL.....	211	3,693	Wage increases.
Do.....	Manufacturing, beverages.....	Soft Drink Workers, AFL.....	150	1,950	Union recognition (demand election).
Do.....	Transportation, trucking.....	Teamsters, AFL.....	8	224(?)	Sympathy (refusal cross picket line) company claimed insubordination.
Do.....	Utility, electrical.....	I. B. E. W., AFL.....	-----	0	Wage increases: Impasse negotiations (settled by mediation).

Nov. 19, 1945, pending: 2 disputes in utilities, 1 dispute in construction. All re wage increases.

EXHIBIT 12A. PRESENTED BY THE HAWAII EQUAL RIGHTS COMMISSION

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION¹PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF HAWAII, COMPARED WITH CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES,
STATISTICAL DATA FOR YEAR 1941-42

This statement provides a comparison between statistical items of the public schools of Hawaii and public schools of the mainland. Statistics for the latter are from the United States Office of Education Circular No. 231 dated 1945.

While mainland statistics are shown separately for rural and urban areas, such a division in Hawaii is unnecessary since all schools operate under the same rules and schedules, achieving uniformity of educational opportunity between the city districts and those of the more remote areas.

Because of the disruption of the school year and consequent loss of school days resulting from the Japanese attack in 1941, enrollment figures for Hawaii are shown for the school year 1942-43 rather than for 1941-42 as shown in the mainland report. All other Hawaii statistics are for 1941-42.

Fifty-year trend.—In 1894, of the 7,732 pupils enrolled in Hawaii's public schools only 1.49 percent were attending high school (grades 9-12).

After 1914, attendance in high school began to increase. This tendency has continued until in 1944, 25.77 percent of all public school pupils were enrolled in the high school grades. This is comparable to the figure 26 percent shown for the continental United States.

Average length of school year:		Average number of pupils enrolled per teacher:	
United States:	Days	United States:	Days
Urban	181.3	Urban	31.4
Rural	167.2	Rural	26.1
Hawaii	185.0	Hawaii	27.9
Average number of days attended by each pupil enrolled:			
United States:			
Urban	152.6		
Rural	146.0		
Hawaii	170.5		

¹ See also exhibit 31 relating to selective service rejections.

Average annual salary per member of instructional staff:

United States:	
Urban	\$2, 013. 00
Rural	1, 018. 00
Hawaii	2, 014. 00

(NOTE.—Since this date, a general salary increase of \$384 and an annual bonus of \$540 per year has been granted every teacher. This is an addition to the regular increments allowed for years of service.)

Current expense per pupil in average daily attendance:

United States:	
Urban	\$131. 83
Rural	84. 41
Hawaii	90. 74

Capital outlay per pupil per average daily attendance:

United States:	
Urban	5. 80
Rural	7. 38
Hawaii	7. 56

Value of school property per pupil enrolled:

United States:	
Urban	\$429. 00
Rural	200. 00
Hawaii	243. 00

Other information pertinent to Hawaii's schools is shown in the following tables.

EXHIBIT 12B. PRESENTED BY THE HAWAII EQUAL RIGHTS COMMISSION

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

TABLE I.—*Number of schools, teachers, and pupils in the Territory of Hawaii, June 30, 1945*

	Number of schools	Teachers			Pupils		
		Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
Public.....	184	593	2,604	3,197	41,305	40,252	81,557
Private.....	86	128	548	676	9,748	11,087	20,835
Total.....	270	721	3,152	3,873	51,053	51,339	102,392

¹ This figure includes 3,148 teachers who are paid from teachers' salaries fund, and 49 employees who are paid from other sources; Rehabilitation (5), dental division (22), health division (2), and Territorial School for Deaf and Blind (20).

² This figure includes 96 children enrolled at the Territorial School for Deaf and Blind. Teachers College is not included herein.

EXHIBIT 12C. PRESENTED BY THE HAWAII EQUAL RIGHTS COMMISSION

TABLE II.—*Public schools, teachers, and pupils, by islands and districts, June 30, 1945*

Islands by districts	Number of schools	Teachers			Pupils		
		Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
Hawaii:							
Central Hawaii.....	22	52	250	302	3,731	3,921	7,652
East Hawaii.....	13	44	130	174	2,012	2,016	4,028
West Hawaii.....	21	51	141	192	2,348	2,343	4,691
Total.....	56	147	521	668	8,091	8,280	16,371
Maui:							
East Maui.....	18	46	172	218	2,524	2,459	4,983
West Maui.....	21	79	194	273	3,361	3,015	6,376
Total.....	39	125	366	491	5,885	5,474	11,359
Oahu:							
Honolulu.....	42	186	1,071	1,257	16,893	16,652	33,545
Rural Oahu.....	27	66	414	480	6,753	6,285	13,038
Total.....	69	252	1,485	1,737	23,646	22,937	46,583
Kauai.....	20	69	232	301	3,683	3,561	7,244
Grand total.....	184	593	2,604	3,197	41,305	40,252	81,557

EXHIBIT 12D. PRESENTED BY THE HAWAII EQUAL RIGHTS COMMISSION

TABLE III.—*Number of pupils in the public schools, by islands, according to the courses of study, June 30, 1945*

Grades	Hawaii	Maui	Oahu	Kauai	Total
1.....	1,360	1,061	4,054	690	7,165
2.....	1,442	974	4,026	641	7,083
3.....	1,346	939	3,877	626	6,788
4.....	1,409	1,055	4,009	629	7,102
5.....	1,523	1,094	4,063	654	7,334
6.....	1,509	1,120	4,035	651	7,315
7.....	1,609	1,101	4,278	740	7,728
8.....	1,459	984	4,332	672	7,447
9.....	1,452	857	3,999	551	6,859
10.....	1,238	797	3,612	516	6,163
11.....	1,040	673	3,028	428	5,169
12.....	872	572	2,636	351	4,431
Specials.....	112	132	420	85	749
Opportunity.....			118	10	128
Deaf and blind.....			96		96
Grand total.....	16,371	11,359	46,583	7,244	81,557

EXHIBIT 12E. PRESENTED BY THE HAWAII EQUAL RIGHTS COMMISSION

TABLE IV.—*Pupils by racial descent, public and private schools*

(See also exhibit 2i relating to racial distribution)

	Number of pupils						Percentage of totals					
	Public schools		Private schools		Totals		Public schools		Private schools		Totals	
	1936-37	1944-45	1936-37	1944-45	1936-37	1944-45	1936-37	1944-45	1936-37	1944-45	1936-37	1944-45
Hawaiian.....	2,747	2,489	547	364	3,294	2,853	3.18	3.03	3.66	1.75	3.25	2.77
Part Hawaiian.....	10,302	13,901	3,606	4,836	13,908	18,737	11.93	16.90	24.13	23.23	13.72	18.18
Portuguese.....	5,374	4,254	2,228	2,417	7,602	6,671	6.22	5.17	14.91	11.61	7.50	6.47
Puerto Rican.....	1,601	1,730	103	178	1,704	1,908	1.85	2.10	.69	.86	1.68	1.85
Spanish.....	272	171	68	68	340	239	.31	.21	.45	.33	.34	.23
Other Caucasian.....	3,817	2,324	2,607	2,877	6,424	5,201	4.42	2.83	17.44	13.82	6.34	5.05
Chinese.....	6,568	4,343	1,969	2,770	8,537	7,113	7.60	5.28	13.17	13.31	8.43	6.90
Japanese.....	46,292	40,412	2,874	5,266	49,166	45,678	53.59	49.14	19.23	25.30	48.52	44.32
Korean.....	2,065	1,222	239	263	2,304	1,486	2.39	1.49	1.60	1.26	2.27	1.44
Filipino.....	5,778	7,915	333	1,044	6,111	8,960	6.69	9.62	2.23	5.01	6.03	8.70
All others.....	1,570	3,479	372	732	1,942	4,211	1.82	4.23	2.49	3.52	1.92	4.09
Total.....	86,386	82,241	14,946	20,815	101,332	103,056	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

EXHIBIT 12F. PRESENTED BY THE HAWAII EQUAL RIGHTS COMMISSION

TABLE V.—*Classification of public school pupils, by citizenship, June 30, 1945*

Place of birth	Hawaii	Maui	Oahu	Kauai	Male	Female	Total	Percent- age of total
Born in United States of America.....	16,337	11,345	46,458	7,227	41,211	40,156	81,367	99.77
Foreign-born.....	34	14	125	17	94	96	190	.23
Total.....	16,371	11,359	46,583	7,244	41,305	40,252	81,557	100

EXHIBIT 12G. PRESENTED BY THE HAWAII EQUAL RIGHTS COMMISSION

TABLE VI.—*Racial distribution of pupils in first grade over 11-year period, public and private schools*

(See also exhibit 21 relating to racial distribution)

	1934-35	1935-36	1936-37	1937-38	1938-39	1939-40	1940-41	1941-42	1942-43	1943-44	1944-45
Hawaiian:											
Number.....	489	534	540	498	483	413	402	405	331	346	360
Percent.....	4.45	4.90	4.96	4.77	4.63	4.30	4.24	4.30	3.94	4.05	4.11
Part Hawaiian:											
Number.....	1,578	1,620	1,768	1,691	1,741	1,729	1,820	1,895	1,824	1,961	2,106
Percent.....	14.37	14.96	16.23	16.18	16.68	17.97	19.19	20.10	21.69	22.97	24.06
Portuguese:											
Number.....	1,005	960	925	892	854	806	753	719	716	667	629
Percent.....	9.15	8.80	8.49	8.54	8.18	8.38	7.94	7.63	8.51	7.81	7.19
Puerto Rican:											
Number.....	306	322	299	289	268	278	245	250	247	245	220
Percent.....	2.79	2.95	2.74	2.77	2.57	2.89	2.58	2.65	2.94	2.87	2.51
Spanish:											
Number.....	51	45	50	27	25	28	21	21	24	9	16
Percent.....	.46	.40	.46	.26	.24	.29	.22	.22	.29	.11	.18
Other Caucasian:											
Number.....	551	570	582	633	670	630	717	847	390	342	427
Percent.....	5.02	5.22	5.34	6.06	6.42	6.55	7.56	8.98	4.64	4.01	4.88
Chinese:											
Number.....	730	691	663	637	561	560	536	522	455	420	453
Percent.....	6.65	6.73	6.09	5.10	5.38	5.82	5.65	5.54	5.41	4.92	5.18
Japanese:											
Number.....	4,838	4,714	4,573	4,303	4,223	3,604	3,430	3,298	2,963	3,051	3,025
Percent.....	44.06	43.25	41.97	42.18	40.47	37.47	36.17	34.98	35.24	35.74	34.56
Korean:											
Number.....	179	165	178	136	132	104	104	84	65	63	64
Percent.....	1.63	1.50	1.63	1.30	1.26	1.08	1.10	.89	.77	.74	.73
Filipino:											
Number.....	985	993	1,012	1,026	1,105	1,036	1,041	946	906	925	904
Percent.....	8.98	9.10	9.29	9.82	10.59	10.77	10.98	10.03	10.77	10.84	10.33
All others:											
Number.....	268	283	305	316	373	431	415	441	488	507	549
Percent.....	2.44	2.59	2.80	3.02	3.58	4.48	4.37	4.68	5.80	5.94	6.27
Total:											
Number.....	10,980	10,987	10,985	10,448	10,435	9,619	9,484	9,428	8,409	8,536	8,753
Percent.....	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

EXHIBIT 12H. PRESENTED BY THE HAWAII EQUAL RIGHTS COMMISSION

UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII

HONOLULU, T. H.

The University of Hawaii is a Federal land-grant college supported by Federal grants, Territorial appropriations, and university income. During the biennium 1943-45, the financial support from the above sources was as follows:

	Amount	Percent
Federal grants.....	\$679,672	21.74
Territorial appropriations.....	1,588,060	50.80
University income.....	558,296	27.46
Total.....	3,126,028	100.00

A board of regents exercises general management and control over all the affairs of the university. There are nine members, seven of whom are appointed by the Governor, with the consent of the Territorial senate, and two of whom are ex officio. Of the appointed members, there must be at least one member from each of the counties of Hawaii, Maui, and Kauai. The ex-officio members are the superintendent of public instruction and the university president. The president is also the board's executive officer.

Enrollment, year 1940-41:

Postgraduate students	406
Regular undergraduate students	2,030
Seniors	321
Juniors	392
Sophomores	510
Freshmen	798
Public-health nurses	9
Unclassified students	269
Total	2,765
Less duplicates	—19
Total	2,746
Summer session:	
1940	1,265
1941	1,026

Enrollment, year 1944-45:

Postgraduate students	145
Regular undergraduate students	1,463
Seniors	169
Juniors	238
Sophomores	360
Freshmen	689
Public-health nurse	7
Unclassified students	551
Total	2,159
Less duplicates	—17
Total	2,142
Evening session	1,459
Postgraduates	242
Undergraduates	981
Auditors	236
Summer session:	
1944 (9 weeks)	1,256
1945 (6 weeks)	862

EXHIBIT 12I. PRESENTED BY THE HAWAII EQUAL RIGHTS COMMISSION

PUBLIC LIBRARIES OF HAWAII

The Territory of Hawaii has complete county library service provided by four public libraries which receive biennial appropriations from the Territory.

The Library of Hawaii was created in 1909 by the Territorial legislature. This library served all the islands, as well as Oahu, through its islands department, until 1921, when legislation was passed making it possible for county libraries to be organized and to receive support from the Territory. From small beginnings, the following four libraries now have substantial appropriations to take care of their areas of the population.

	Estimated population, June 30, 1945 (Office of Civilian Defense figures)	Biennial Territorial appropria- tion	Annual per capita cost
Library of Hawaii (island of Oahu)	348,045	\$378,064	\$0.57
Hawaii County Library (island of Hawaii)	70,049	92,662	.66
Maui County Library (Maui, Molokai, Lanai)	50,899	86,800	.85
Kauai Library Association (island of Kauai)	32,650	63,460	.97
Total	501,643	620,986	.618

Statistics showing use of public libraries for year ending June 30, 1945

	Distrib- uting agencies	Registered card holders	Book stock	Circulation of books and peri- odicals	Staff
Library of Hawaii-----	60	65, 513	181, 219	832, 416	70
Hawaii County Library-----	66	17, 726	80, 725	309, 581	25
Maui County Library-----	48	14, 893	59, 920	246, 254	20
Kauai Library Association-----	27	14, 303	29, 845	152, 028	20
Total-----	201	82, 435	351, 709	1, 540, 279	135

¹ Central library only.

Distributing agencies.—In addition to the central library, there are small branch libraries, some in their own buildings, and deposit collections located in stores, banks, social halls, or offices. Rural schools are served with deposit collections or by regular visits of the bookmobile. Each island owns its own bookmobile.

Registered card holders.—Not all the users of the public library are card holders. For the small deposit collections, an index file of names and addresses is kept of all borrowers and books are charged by writing the borrower's name on the book card. The library of Hawaii estimates 10,000 readers without cards.

Stock.—Each library has available a large collection of current and reference periodicals. The library of Hawaii estimates its holdings at 63,000 unbound periodicals. There are also phonograph records, maps, mounted pictures, and pamphlets available in each library.

Circulation of books and periodicals.—In spite of the great numbers of servicemen making use of the library facilities, there has been a decided loss in circulation since war began. Some of the obvious reasons were the heavy load of war work taken on by all civilians in the community, the lack of leisure, gasoline, and ventilation during blackout. The circulation of children's books amounts to 52 percent of the total for all the islands.

Services to the armed forces.—Each county library extended its services to the men and women in uniform in every way possible. On Hawaii, Maui, and Kauai the libraries turned over their bookmobiles to serve the camps and librarians scheduled regular trips to as many places as could be reached. On Oahu, the Army and Navy libraries were better organized than on the outside islands and the library of Hawaii supplemented the collections of the Army posts and hospitals with loans of books to meet individual special requests. The library of Hawaii found its field of service in supplying books for the civilian war workers in their camps and barracks. Many special libraries for these groups were organized in the first 3 years of the war and, as was to be expected many books were lost when men were transferred on short notice and could not be traced.

Special services provided by library of Hawaii.—Reference work: The library of Hawaii devotes a great deal of time to reference work. The reference collection, including many rare and valuable items in the fields of Hawaiiana and art, totals 20,130 volumes, 11 percent of the entire collection. The main library reports an average of 3,913 reference questions answered each month in the adult department and 252 in the children's room.

Special collections.—Special collections include the Hawaii and Pacific division, music and art division, and the department for the blind. In connection with the music division, we have since the war provided a listening room for those wishing to hear the best in musical recordings. This was patronized last year by 7,256 listeners. In addition, 1,509 musicians made use of the library piano. The department for the blind is in charge of a totally blind person who works under the supervision of the director of the extension department. In addition to 2,406 volumes in Braille, there are available 802 titles in the talking-book records. These have a constant and vigorous circulation. The library of Hawaii is one of 19 regional libraries supplied with books for the blind by the Library of Congress.

Lectures and movies.—The library of Hawaii carries on weekly programs of lectures, movies, or music. For the special benefit of the servicemen many of the lectures were on the general subject of Hawaii, its history, language, legends, volcanoes, etc. The movies shown were generally obtained through the courtesy of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, and many of the musicians appearing on our programs were servicemen or women.

Attendance.—A count of the people entering the main building is taken for 1 week twice a year to provide a basis of estimating the attendance. The peak attendance was in 1944 when an average of 13,566 people entered the library each week. In 1945, this average was 12,281.

EXHIBIT 13A. PRESENTED BY THE HAWAII EQUAL RIGHTS COMMISSION

Percentage of registrants voting, 1938, by racial groups

Racial group	Number of registrants	Number voting	Percentage of registrants voting
Hawaiian.....	22,256	19,716	88.51
Caucasian.....	25,491	21,876	85.81
Chinese.....	7,160	6,490	90.64
Japanese.....	23,777	21,194	89.13
All others.....	4,628	3,907	84.42
Total.....	83,312	73,183	87.88

EXHIBIT 13B. PRESENTED BY THE HAWAII EQUAL RIGHTS COMMISSION

Registered voters, by racial groups, at each general election

Year	Hawaiian	Caucasian	Chinese	Japanese	All others	Total
1900.....						¹ 11,216
1902.....	8,680	3,072	143	3	714	12,612
1904.....	9,260	3,142	175	2	674	13,253
1906.....	9,635	3,176	220		547	13,578
1908.....	8,967	3,512	272	6	517	13,274
1910.....	9,619	3,847	396	13	567	14,442
1912.....	9,435	4,678	486	48	538	15,185
1914.....	10,308	5,966	654	112	659	17,699
1916.....	10,763	6,542	777	179	720	18,981
1918.....	10,901	7,290	954	287	692	20,124
1920.....	14,650	9,122	1,141	658	764	26,335
1922 (S).....	15,081	10,659	1,242	970	855	28,806
1922.....	16,817	12,058	1,499	1,135	982	32,491
1924.....	16,685	13,140	2,016	1,711	1,187	34,739
1926.....	17,763	15,407	2,906	3,092	1,401	40,569
1928.....	18,952	16,708	3,950	4,839	1,609	46,058
1930.....	19,858	19,096	4,402	7,017	1,776	52,149
1932.....	21,582	23,934	5,356	11,273	1,696	63,831
1934.....	21,936	25,994	6,075	15,317	1,946	71,168
1936.....	21,665	25,927	6,499	18,698	2,270	75,059
1938.....	22,256	25,491	7,160	23,777	4,628	83,312
1940.....	21,581	26,322	7,422	27,107	4,880	87,312
1942.....						¹ 85,292
1944.....						¹ 84,326

¹ No figures on racial distribution.

EXHIBIT 13C. PRESENTED BY THE HAWAII EQUAL RIGHTS COMMISSION

Number and percentage of registered voters in Hawaii in 5 racial groups

	1932		1934		1936		1938		1940	
	Num- ber	Per- cent	Num- ber	Per- cent	Num- ber	Per- cent	Num- ber	Per- cent	Num- ber	Per- cent
Hawaiian.....	21,582	33.8	23,050	32.3	21,665	28.9	22,256	26.7	21,581	24.7
Caucasian.....	24,332	38.2	25,786	36.1	25,927	34.5	25,491	30.6	26,322	30.1
Chinese.....	5,356	8.3	5,911	8.4	6,499	8.7	7,160	8.6	7,422	8.5
Japanese.....	11,273	17.6	14,799	20.7	18,698	24.9	23,777	28.5	27,107	31.1
All others.....	1,188	1.8	1,650	2.3	2,270	3.0	4,628	5.6	4,880	5.6
Total.....	63,831	100.0	71,276	100.0	75,059	100.0	83,312	100.0	87,312	100.0

EXHIBIT 13D. PRESENTED BY THE HAWAII EQUAL RIGHTS COMMISSION

Percentage of registrants voting—general elections

Year	Number of registrants	Number voting ¹	Percent of registrants voting	Year	Number of registrants	Number voting ¹	Percent of registrants voting
1900.....	11,216	9,589	85.49	1922.....	32,491	25,972	79.94
1902.....	12,612	11,326	89.80	1924.....	34,739	29,717	85.54
1904.....	13,253	11,990	90.47	1926.....	40,569	34,532	85.12
1906.....	13,578	12,430	91.55	1928.....	46,058	38,939	84.54
1908.....	13,274	12,316	92.78	1930.....	52,149	43,544	83.50
1910.....	14,442	13,541	93.76	1932.....	63,831	57,651	90.32
1912.....	15,185	13,340	87.85	1934.....	71,168	62,427	87.72
1914.....	17,699	11,809	66.72	1936.....	75,059	64,184	85.51
1916.....	18,981	13,339	70.28	1938.....	83,312	73,182	87.84
1918.....	20,124	13,375	66.46	1940.....	87,312	74,538	85.37
1920.....	26,335	22,336	84.81	1942.....	85,292	63,359	74.28
1922 (S).....	28,806	24,213	84.06	1944.....	84,326	71,704	85.03

¹ Votes received for Delegate only, 1900 to 1928, inclusive.

EXHIBIT 13E. PRESENTED BY THE HAWAII EQUAL RIGHTS COMMISSION

Votes received by candidates for Delegate to Congress at each general election

Year	Repub- lican Party	Democ- ratic Party	Home Rule	Other parties	Total	Year	Repub- lican Party	Democ- ratic Party	Home Rule	Other parties	Total
1900.....	3,856	1,650	4,083	-----	9,589	1922.....	11,667	14,305	-----	-----	25,972
1902.....	6,628	-----	4,698	-----	11,326	1924.....	12,689	17,028	-----	-----	29,717
1904.....	6,833	2,868	2,289	-----	11,990	1926.....	18,160	16,372	-----	-----	34,532
1906.....	7,364	2,884	2,182	-----	12,430	1928.....	27,908	11,031	-----	-----	38,939
1908.....	5,698	3,824	2,794	-----	12,316	1930.....	22,223	19,568	-----	-----	41,791
1910.....	8,049	4,503	989	-----	13,541	1932.....	27,017	29,431	-----	-----	56,448
1912.....	7,023	5,770	346	201	13,340	1934.....	31,487	29,630	-----	-----	61,117
1914.....	8,590	2,609	-----	610	11,809	1936.....	41,183	18,417	-----	-----	59,600
1916.....	7,702	5,637	-----	-----	13,359	1938.....	41,009	28,890	-----	-----	69,899
1918.....	7,343	6,032	-----	-----	13,375	1940.....	54,466	-----	-----	-----	54,466
1920.....	13,626	8,710	-----	-----	22,336	1942.....	39,856	19,746	-----	-----	59,602
1922 (S).....	14,937	9,113	-----	163	24,213	1944.....	52,074	-----	-----	-----	52,074

EXHIBIT 13F. PRESENTED BY THE HAWAII EQUAL RIGHTS COMMISSION

Senators and representatives, by parties, in each legislature

Biennial session	Senators			Representatives		
	Repub- lican	Demo- crat	Home rule and others	Repub- lican	Demo- crat	Home rule and others
1901.....	6	-----	9	9	4	17
1903.....	10	1	4	20	-----	10
1905.....	14	1	-----	28	1	1
1907.....	12	2	1	24	6	-----
1909.....	9	4	2	22	7	1
1911.....	12	1	2	28	-----	2
1913.....	8	5	2	18	11	1
1915.....	8	7	-----	29	1	-----
1917.....	12	3	-----	24	6	-----
1919.....	14	1	-----	24	6	-----
1921.....	14	1	-----	26	4	-----
1923.....	15	-----	-----	29	1	-----
1925.....	13	2	-----	27	3	-----
1927.....	13	-----	-----	28	2	-----
1929.....	14	1	-----	27	3	-----
1931.....	14	1	-----	27	3	-----
1933.....	11	4	-----	20	10	-----
1935.....	10	5	-----	23	7	-----
1937.....	10	4	1	26	4	-----
1939.....	11	3	1	28	2	-----
1941.....	12	3	-----	27	3	-----
1943.....	11	4	-----	25	5	-----
1945.....	8	7	-----	21	9	-----

EXHIBIT 13G. PRESENTED BY THE HAWAII EQUAL RIGHTS COMMISSION

Citizen population of voting age and votes cast, in the States and in the Territory of Hawaii, 1942, by number and by percentage

[Numbers in thousands]

State	Population, 1940	Citizens of voting age	Vote for single office receiving highest vote, 1942 (general or primary) ¹	Votes cast as percent- age of number of citizens of voting age	Votes cast as percent- age of population, 1940
Alabama.....	2,832	1,555	279	17.9	9.8
Arizona.....	499	263	90	34.2	18.0
Arkansas.....	1,949	1,098	228	20.8	11.7
California.....	6,907	4,455	2,234	50.1	32.3
Colorado.....	1,123	688	347	50.4	30.9
Connecticut.....	1,709	1,011	575	56.9	33.6
Delaware.....	266	171	85	49.7	31.9
Florida.....	1,897	1,187	258	31.7	13.6
Georgia.....	3,123	1,768	301	17.0	9.6
Idaho.....	524	305	144	47.2	27.5
Illinois.....	7,897	5,119	2,973	58.1	37.6
Indiana.....	3,427	2,198	1,289	58.6	37.6
Iowa.....	2,538	1,608	707	43.9	27.8
Kansas.....	1,801	1,144	507	44.3	28.1
Kentucky.....	2,845	1,630	392	24.0	13.8
Louisiana.....	2,363	1,364	321	23.5	13.6
Maine.....	847	493	186	37.7	21.9
Maryland.....	1,821	1,153	377	32.7	20.7
Massachusetts.....	4,316	2,575	1,401	54.4	32.5
Michigan.....	5,256	3,131	1,228	39.1	23.3
Minnesota.....	2,792	1,730	794	45.9	28.4
Mississippi.....	2,183	1,195	133	11.1	6.1
Missouri.....	3,784	2,463	925	37.5	24.4
Montana.....	559	343	170	49.6	30.4
Nebraska.....	1,315	817	380	46.5	28.9
Nevada.....	110	70	40	57.1	36.4
New Hampshire.....	491	295	162	54.9	33.0
New Jersey.....	4,160	2,592	1,222	47.1	29.4

Footnotes at end of table.

Citizen population of voting age and votes cast, in the States and in the Territory of Hawaii, 1942, by number and by percentage—Continued

[Numbers in thousands]

State	Population, 1940	Citizens of voting age	Vote for single office receiving highest vote, 1942 (general or primary) ¹	Votes cast as percentage of number of citizens of voting age	Votes cast as percentage of population, 1940
New Mexico.....	531	275	108	39.3	20.3
New York.....	13,479	8,327	4,121	49.5	30.6
North Carolina.....	3,571	1,925	349	18.1	9.8
North Dakota.....	641	358	175	48.9	27.3
Ohio.....	6,907	4,404	1,796	40.8	26.0
Oklahoma.....	2,336	1,362	430	31.6	18.4
Oregon.....	1,089	717	282	39.3	25.9
Pennsylvania.....	9,900	6,031	2,548	42.2	25.7
Rhode Island.....	713	424	238	56.1	33.4
South Carolina.....	1,899	989	234	23.7	12.3
South Dakota.....	642	378	181	47.8	28.2
Tennessee.....	2,915	1,703	297	17.4	10.2
Texas.....	6,414	3,710	983	26.5	15.3
Utah.....	550	298	150	50.3	27.3
Vermont.....	359	214	58	27.1	16.1
Virginia.....	2,677	1,567	90	57.4	33.6
Washington.....	1,736	1,123	428	38.1	24.6
West Virginia.....	1,901	1,046	463	44.3	25.3
Wisconsin.....	3,137	1,941	800	41.2	25.5
Wyoming.....	250	150	77	51.3	30.8
HAWAII.....	423	2161	59	36.6	13.9
Median.....				42.2	25.9

¹ Since the vote for single offices varies widely within the same election, vote counted is the total vote for the single office receiving the highest State-wide vote. Since the primary election is the more important contest in some States, the vote counted here is the primary or general election vote for 1942, whichever is higher.

² Estimated.

³ Vote used for Hawaii is the total vote cast for office of Delegate to Congress, which is the only Territory-wide elective office.

EXHIBIT 13H. PRESENTED BY THE HAWAII EQUAL RIGHTS COMMISSION

Number and percent of registrants and votes cast—Honolulu and comparable United States cities

City	Total population ¹	Number of registrants	Number voting ²	Percent of total population registered	Percent of population voting	Percent of registrants voting
Honolulu, 1940.....	179,326	50,615	43,099	28.22	24.03	85.15
Chicago.....	3,396,808	1,790,649	1,014,509	52.70	29.85	56.67
Detroit.....	1,623,452	711,076	279,457	43.80	17.21	39.30
Baltimore.....	859,100	368,563	65,505	42.89	7.57	17.77
Boston.....	770,816	364,190	208,749	47.23	27.07	67.31
Cleveland.....	878,336	425,673	152,834	48.45	17.39	35.90
St. Louis.....	816,048	348,476	96,642	42.69	11.84	27.73
San Francisco.....	634,536	367,352	195,147	57.88	30.74	53.11
Columbus.....	306,087	153,553	66,534	50.16	21.74	43.34
Houston.....	384,514	101,000	28,664	26.26	7.45	28.37
Kansas City, Mo.....	399,178	175,377	57,008	43.92	14.28	32.57
Minneapolis.....	492,370	261,814	127,850	53.17	25.95	48.81
Portland, Oreg.....	305,394	153,464	83,702	50.24	27.41	54.56
Providence, R. I.....	253,504	117,792	38,129	46.42	15.03	32.38
St. Paul.....	287,736	169,198	45,048	55.30	15.65	28.30
Seattle.....	368,302	212,112	86,684	57.58	23.53	40.86

¹ Population figures for 1940.

² Vote is for proposition receiving highest vote where more than 1 proposal voted upon. Figures for cities other than Honolulu are from Statistical Abstract of United States, 1943, U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, p. 239.

NOTE.—The data from which this tabulation is made are not strictly comparable since the election year varies. Also, the election data for Honolulu for 1940 represents votes cast for candidates in the general election, while votes in other cities are on constitutional and policy propositions. The tabulation furnishes a guide, however, to participation in elections on a comparative basis.

EXHIBIT 13I. PRESENTED BY THE HAWAII EQUAL RIGHTS COMMISSION

OFFICIAL TABULATION—RESULTS OF VOTES CAST, STATEHOOD PLEBISCITE, TERRITORY OF HAWAII, HELD TUESDAY, NOV. 5, 1940

Summary

Districts.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total
Voters registered.....	12,477	4,787	11,952	28,307	22,063	7,735	87,321
Votes cast.....	10,616	3,991	10,198	24,168	18,930	6,635	74,538
Yes.....	6,950	2,724	6,676	13,741	11,623	4,460	46,174
No.....	2,861	923	2,731	8,645	5,599	1,669	22,428
Not voting.....	485	199	571	1,028	882	290	3,455
Ballots rejected.....	352	143	362	766	804	218	2,645

EXHIBIT 14A. PRESENTED BY THE HAWAII EQUAL RIGHTS COMMISSION

Summary of expenditures and personnel, Territory of Hawaii, Board of Health

Fiscal year	Popula- tion	Per capita cost	Total expendi- tures	Distribution by percentage			Total person- nel ¹
				Terri- torial funds	Federal funds	Other sources	
1937.....	396,715	1.66	656,923.81	81.8	18.2	(2)	(2)
1938.....	411,485	1.33	545,746.54	78.6	21.4	(2)	(2)
1939.....	414,991	1.34	556,690.75	79.2	20.8	(2)	(2)
1940.....	426,654	1.58	675,134.47	72.8	22.8	4.4	302
1941.....	465,339	1.58	734,220.79	69.5	23.7	6.8	315
1942.....	474,351	1.75	831,553.73	72.3	21.1	6.6	361
1943.....	483,363	1.87	903,268.73	71.8	21.1	7.1	375
1944.....	492,379	2.66	1,309,471.61	64.6	27.9	7.5	463
1945.....	502,122	3.23	1,623,385.46	67.9	27.6	4.5	525
Total.....			7,836,395.89	71.6	23.7	4.7	-----

¹ Army and USPHS personnel assigned to Board of Health not included.² No record on file.

EXHIBIT 14I. PRESENTED BY THE HAWAII EQUAL RIGHTS COMMISSION

Public assistance payments in the States and in the Territory of Hawaii, by number of recipients and by size of average monthly grant, August 1945

State	Old age assistance		Aid to dependent children		Aid to blind		General assistance	
	Number of recipients	Average monthly grant	Number of families	Average per family	Number of recipients	Average monthly grant	Number of cases	Average monthly grant
Total.....	2,033,184	\$29.97	255,120	\$48.06	71,025	\$31.91	230,000	\$29.71
Alabama.....	32,379	14.54	5,238	25.62	765	16.55	3,243	14.31
Alaska.....	1,321	36.41	31	-----	453	46.43	136	41.39
Arizona.....	9,431	38.60	1,376	39.63	-----	-----	1,766	29.58
Arkansas.....	26,469	16.47	4,124	25.55	1,162	18.48	2,617	12.01
California.....	158,050	47.32	6,373	83.98	5,351	47.83	11,483	38.15
Colorado.....	40,201	41.38	3,086	56.57	4,460	36.59	2,920	30.73
Connecticut.....	13,982	39.32	2,029	78.80	127	37.39	2,395	32.65
Delaware.....	1,269	16.49	266	72.13	-----	-----	338	26.44
District of Columbia.....	2,388	36.14	604	68.65	197	39.91	737	41.14
Florida.....	41,245	29.09	5,718	33.68	2,292	30.07	4,000	-----
Georgia.....	66,342	11.47	3,890	25.03	2,012	14.19	2,521	11.89
Hawaii.....	1,431	23.41	492	63.53	63	24.89	503	31.51

Footnotes at end of table.

Public assistance payments in the States and in the Territory of Hawaii by number of recipients and by size of average monthly grant, August 1945—Continued

State	Old age assistance		Aid to dependent children		Aid to blind		General assistance	
	Number of recipients	Average monthly grant	Number of families	Average per family	Number of recipients	Average monthly grant	Number of cases	Average monthly grant
Idaho	9,611	32.10	1,170	52.96	206	33.66	493	21.40
Illinois	121,084	32.39	19,733	50.12	5,118	34.12	22,376	31.55
Indiana	54,613	25.74	5,846	36.64	1,982	29.50	5,588	21.02
Iowa	48,975	32.00	7,445	30.91	1,235	34.68	3,579	18.44
Kansas	28,015	29.04	2,789	49.84	1,051	31.42	3,158	29.08
Kentucky	47,059	11.54	4,795	21.65	1,568	13.02	1,500	-----
Louisiana	36,106	23.54	8,890	40.33	1,350	27.05	8,081	17.75
Maine	14,787	29.80	1,333	65.16	811	30.80	1,720	30.97
Maryland	11,512	28.02	2,909	37.24	436	31.36	4,946	32.86
Massachusetts	74,412	42.97	7,048	79.20	962	44.77	12,177	33.67
Michigan	84,474	31.49	12,718	64.60	1,244	34.81	10,691	36.28
Minnesota	54,455	30.34	4,501	48.53	952	37.57	4,578	26.22
Mississippi	27,075	15.66	2,908	26.04	1,475	22.34	330	8.30
Missouri	100,097	23.62	11,029	34.29	3,000	-----	88,101	21.02
Montana	10,679	31.47	1,258	47.07	323	34.81	967	24.53
Nebraska	23,928	28.85	2,097	32.89	441	29.56	1,600	20.20
Nevada	1,927	38.43	63	29.76	28	-----	160	30.94
New Hampshire	6,514	29.94	763	68.39	272	30.10	1,039	27.25
New Jersey	23,317	31.93	3,073	59.53	527	33.81	4,386	32.80
New Mexico	5,910	31.07	2,562	37.53	239	29.12	1,059	15.27
New York	103,138	35.40	19,687	75.02	2,928	39.79	34,278	45.86
North Carolina	32,757	12.79	6,018	25.32	2,358	18.92	2,368	11.16
North Dakota	5,675	33.26	1,398	54.95	110	33.28	574	25.39
Ohio	117,215	30.29	7,181	55.19	3,002	27.29	10,562	27.68
Oklahoma	79,197	35.07	15,095	34.79	1,848	36.22	4,514	-----
Oregon	20,127	37.14	1,211	79.88	374	46.62	3,424	42.56
Pennsylvania	82,611	30.39	22,430	64.07	12,740	39.63	19,793	28.19
Rhode Island	7,240	34.20	1,282	67.43	101	32.48	1,995	31.87
South Carolina	21,603	15.10	3,714	22.74	946	20.40	2,837	13.10
South Dakota	12,635	25.76	1,429	37.30	213	23.35	750	18.83
Tennessee	37,785	16.08	10,928	30.29	1,536	19.92	1,200	-----
Texas	170,553	23.97	11,115	20.84	4,632	24.49	2,700	40.67
Utah	12,782	38.89	1,783	73.46	129	39.85	1,370	22.83
Vermont	5,202	22.76	672	34.41	164	30.68	729	17.27
Virginia	14,932	14.22	3,407	31.26	962	18.29	2,937	50.53
Washington	61,265	49.25	3,574	91.84	584	53.44	4,867	11.43
West Virginia	18,429	15.65	7,036	27.84	804	18.13	3,763	23.41
Wisconsin	44,711	29.37	5,297	55.53	1,375	29.76	4,344	31.27
Wyoming	3,369	36.81	281	58.68	116	39.09	326	-----

¹See also exhibit 63b relating to medical care.

Source: Social Security Bulletin, October 1945, pp. 25-27.

NOTE.—Hawaii ranks thirty-ninth in average monthly grant for old-age assistance; fifteenth in average grant for aid to dependent children; thirty-fifth in average grant for aid to blind; and fifteenth in average grant for general assistance.

EXHIBIT 14J. PRESENTED BY THE HAWAII EQUAL RIGHTS COMMISSION

Public assistance payments—Total amount and amount per inhabitant, 1944¹

State	Total	Amount per inhabitant			
		Old-age assistance	Aid to blind	Aid to dependent children	General assistance
All States	\$937,578,000	\$5.44	\$0.17	\$1.06	\$0.70
Alabama	7,593,000	2.06	.05	.51	.17
Alaska	573,000	-----	-----	-----	-----
Arizona	6,002,000	7.72	.36	1.14	1.32
Arkansas	7,756,000	3.19	.16	.90	.22
California	103,334,000	11.34	.43	.76	.58

Public assistance payments—Total amount and amount per inhabitant, 1944¹—
Continued

State	Total	Amount per inhabitant			
		Old-age assist- ance	Aid to blind	Aid to depend- ent children	General assist- ance
Colorado.....	\$23,625,000	\$19.02	\$0.21	\$1.39	\$1.62
Connecticut.....	8,519,000	3.35	.03	.92	.57
Delaware.....	536,000	.97		.65	.34
District of Columbia.....	1,797,000	1.22	.12	.45	.41
Florida.....	13,787,000	5.64	.35	.62	
Georgia.....	10,963,000	3.04	.12	.40	.12
Hawaii.....	938,000	.74	.38	.72	.40
Idaho.....	4,472,000	7.60	.18	1.37	.30
Illinois.....	69,507,000	6.30	.25	1.19	1.45
Indiana.....	22,484,000	5.07	.24	.90	.44
Iowa.....	20,113,000	7.74	.23	.41	.45
Kansas.....	13,018,000	5.71	.24	1.11	.70
Kentucky.....	8,811,000	2.79	.09	.43	
Louisiana.....	16,054,000	4.16	.20	1.94	.63
Maine.....	6,823,000	6.25	.37	1.19	.92
Maryland.....	6,959,000	1.95	.08	.64	.84
Massachusetts.....	48,538,000	8.94	.11	1.58	1.23
Michigan.....	43,650,000	5.59	.09	1.72	.71
Minnesota.....	24,473,000	7.76	.15	1.02	.75
Mississippi.....	4,939,000	1.95	.12	.39	.01
Missouri.....	33,895,000	7.77		1.23	.61
Montana.....	4,918,000	8.28	.24	1.22	.72
Nebraska.....	9,596,000	6.77	.14	.91	.34
Nevada.....	954,000	6.94			.37
New Hampshire.....	3,232,000	4.88	.20	1.02	1.02
New Jersey.....	13,232,000	2.14	.05	.54	.51
New Mexico.....	3,318,000	4.23	.19	2.00	.35
New York.....	84,445,000	3.48	.10	1.32	1.88
North Carolina.....	6,924,000	1.36	.13	.49	.09
North Dakota.....	4,208,000	5.77	.08	1.64	.35
Ohio.....	52,656,000	6.29	.14	.72	.55
Oklahoma.....	31,182,000	12.34	.34	2.77	.23
Oregon.....	10,310,000	6.59	.16	.88	1.17
Pennsylvania.....	50,410,000	3.16		1.61	.66
Rhode Island.....	4,409,000	3.94	.05	1.26	1.10
South Carolina.....	4,974,000	1.95	.11	.53	.19
South Dakota.....	4,536,000	6.74	.10	1.07	.42
Tennessee.....	12,100,000	2.69	.13	1.43	
Texas.....	48,905,000	7.09	.22	.42	
Utah.....	8,243,000	10.07	.11	2.75	1.20
Vermont.....	1,785,000	4.01	.16	.72	.76
Virginia.....	4,332,000	.88	.07	.41	.21
Washington.....	33,696,000	14.29	.16	1.70	1.54
West Virginia.....	7,834,000	2.29	.13	1.55	.56
Wisconsin.....	21,622,000	5.31	.17	1.32	.63
Wyoming.....	1,629,000	5.40	.22	.78	.50

¹ See also exhibit 63b relating to medical care.

Source: Social Security Bulletin, June 1945, p. 24.

NOTE.—Hawaii ranks fiftieth in old-age assistance per inhabitant; second in aid to blind; thirty-fourth in aid to dependent children; and thirty-second in general assistance.

EXHIBIT 15A. PRESENTED BY THE HAWAII EQUAL RIGHTS COMMISSION

HAWAII'S WAR BOND RECORD, WORLD WAR II

Hawaii has one of the most imposing records of war bond purchases of any State or Territory. The Territory has consistently oversubscribed all quotas and in doing so maintained a similar record set during World War I when all Liberty bond drives were oversubscribed. The World War II record is as follows:

Drive	Quota	Purchase	Percent of sales to quota
First.....	\$4, 250, 000	\$8, 314, 000	195.6
Second.....	16, 700, 000	18, 648, 649	111.0
Third.....	17, 988, 000	20, 353, 867	113.0
Fourth.....	19, 000, 000	32, 453, 959	171.0
Fifth.....	22, 000, 000	31, 041, 424	141.0
Sixth.....	20, 000, 000	41, 100, 418	205.0
Seventh.....	27, 000, 000	50, 104, 395	185.5
Total.....	126, 938, 000	202, 016, 712	160.0

Source: U. S. Treasury Department.

EXHIBIT 15B. PRESENTED BY THE HAWAII EQUAL RIGHTS COMMISSION

HAWAII'S PER CAPITA AVERAGE WAR BOND SALES MAY 1941 THROUGH SEPTEMBER 1945

Hawaii's per capita purchase of E bonds was higher than that of any State or Territory. Hawaii was the only part of the United States to exceed all drive and monthly quotas since the inception of the war-bond program.

E bond per capita average

Hawaii.....	\$531. 12	Connecticut.....	\$413. 02
Washington, D. C.....	520. 57	Washington.....	407. 38
Canal Zone.....	422. 25	Michigan.....	385. 64
Oregon.....	419. 70	California.....	384. 89

Source: U. S. Treasury Department.

EXHIBIT 17. PRESENTED BY THE HAWAII EQUAL RIGHTS COMMISSION

MESSAGE OF INGRAM M. STAINBACK, GOVERNOR OF HAWAII, TO TWENTY-THIRD SESSION OF THE TERRITORIAL LEGISLATURE

FEBRUARY 22, 1945.

Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, and members of the twenty-third legislature, in my first message to the twenty-second legislature I pointed out the responsibility of that body to so adjust the laws of the Territory as to make most effective the total resources of the Territory in our war for national existence.

I am proud of the response of that legislature which so fully measured up to the responsibilities of the elected representatives of Hawaii's people. Most of you were members of that body and I am confident that you will maintain the same fine cooperation and high standards set by it.

I need not remind you that though the Allies are gaining great victories on every front, and though the actual fighting has receded from our doorsteps several thousands of miles westward, the Nation is still at war and there must be no slow-up, no let-down on the home front until victory is won.

In spite of the handicaps of war, the scarcity of materials, supplies, and equipment, and the acute shortage of manpower, the Territorial government has operated efficiently.

I wish here to express my deep appreciation to the heads of the several departments and to those under them for their untiring devotion to duty, and I more particularly wish to thank the members of the several unpaid Territorial boards and commissions who have given so generously of their time and attention to serve the Territory and the war effort.

In suggesting herein certain subjects for your consideration and legislative action, I must remind you that others of equal importance with these will be submitted to you from time to time.

FINANCE

The financial position of the Territory is excellent. It is estimated that at the close of the current fiscal period there will be in the treasury an operating surplus of approximately \$20,617,541, which added to the estimated 1945-47 receipts will provide approximately \$64,392,888 available for Territorial purposes.

The income received by the Territory during the present biennium is unprecedented. This, as you are well aware, has been due to war expenditures within the Territory and the high income resulting therefrom both to business and labor.

Obviously, such war expenditures will not continue indefinitely. I believe that we have already reached, if not passed, the peak of war expenditures in Hawaii. As the large wartime earnings of business and workers go down, so the income of the Territory will correspondingly decrease. It is only prudent in time of plenty to prepare for the lean years to come.

RETIREMENT OF DEBTS

To put our financial house in order, the existing surplus should be used only for capital expenditures, including retirement of debts.

Though it is very difficult to make any accurate estimate of receipts for the next biennium, it would be the height of folly and recklessness to estimate continued receipts upon the same basis as the last few years and to make appropriations for operating expenses of the government on such supposition.

Assuming that the existing tax structure will not be altered in any very material way, the aggregate of the estimated receipts for the next biennium, as set forth in the budget transmitted herewith, is \$13,775,347.

Expenditures for the 1945-47 biennium, as estimated in the budget, total \$39,180,815. The budgetary estimate for expenditures does not include the emergency bonus now payable to employees.

Should this bonus be continued at the same rate for the entire biennium, an additional sum of \$6,000,000 would be required for the next biennium and \$800,000 for the period from March 31 to June 30, 1945, leaving a disposable balance of \$18,412,073.

If the suggestions hereinafter made that tuberculosis hospitals and the several circuit courts be transferred from county maintenance to the Territory involving additional budgetary expenditures of \$2,255,414, and provision be made for the sum of \$1,500,000 to meet any requirements under the Hawaii Defense Act, there will be left approximately \$14,656,659 which might properly be called surplus.

SUGGESTION FOR SURPLUS

I suggest that this surplus be disposed of as follows:

1. Pay in full the Territory's debt to the retirement system for prior service credit.

There is included in the budget an item of \$700,175, which is the Territory's contribution to the pension accumulation fund of the employees' retirement system on account of accrued liability for the biennium 1945-47. On the basis of the present laws, a presently undetermined amount would be required to be paid each biennium until 1985.

The Territorial liability arose by reason of the grant of prior service credit to employees in 1925 and the temporary abandonment of the reserve basis in 1933 without making proper financial provision therefor. According to the actuary, the accrued liability would be entirely liquidated at the present time by payment to the retirement system of the sum of \$3,840,000, necessitating the addition of \$3,139,825 to the amount already set up in the budget.

This would put the retirement system on a real insurance basis—a step which should have been taken long ago. The biennial savings thus effected could be used to meet governmental needs and to provide for pay-as-you-go capital expenditures during the years to come.

It is my recommendation that the amount necessary to completely liquidate the Territory's accrued liability to the employees' retirement system be appropriated and paid at the present time.

2. I recommend the appropriation of not less than \$5,000,000 for the Territorial sinking fund to be used, together with the debt service appropriation set

up in the budget, for the retirement of Territorial bonded indebtedness. This additional sum, when taken with the assets in the sinking fund, and the earnings thereon, would make it possible to redeem and cancel all our term bonds amounting to \$11,880,000 by November 15, 1947, and also would make it possible to redeem and cancel approximately \$3,250,000 of refunding serial bonds in the next 4 years—a total of \$15,130,000.

The fullest possible advantage should be taken of our present opportunity to discharge a substantial part of our public debt. Surplus funds thus used will earn money for all taxpayers in the form of reduced debt service charges and also improve our borrowing capacity for future needs.

3. It is also recommended that some \$4,000,000 be set aside in a revolving fund for the rehabilitation of roads and highways in Hawaii damaged by reason of war operations of the Army and Navy and their contractors.

Under congressional legislation, reimbursement may be obtained from the Federal Government for such expenditures. It is estimated that our Territorial roads have been damaged to the extent of \$8,000,000.

4. There would be left the sum of \$2,516,834 for disposition. This should be earmarked for the immediate acquisition of lands and construction of facilities for the Training School for Boys, the acquisition of lands for the University of Hawaii, for the civic center, and for other desirable purposes.

Authorization should be given to officials of the Territorial and city-county governments to invest any moneys set up as reserves or otherwise not needed for current requirements in short-term obligations of the Federal Government. This will give the taxpayers the benefit of drawing interest on moneys not immediately required for public purposes and will also assist the Federal Government in the financing of the war effort.

BONUS AND ADJUSTED COMPENSATION

In January 1944, a rule was made under the Hawaii Defense Act adjusting and making uniform the compensation schedules applicable to employees of the Territory and county government.

Provision was also made for emergency bonus payments to such employees. This step was taken when it became apparent that the efficient and effective continuation of vital governmental services was being endangered by the disparity between the rates of compensation paid to Territorial and county employees and the rates being paid to business, industrial and Federal employees in the Territory.

I continued this rule in effect to March 31, 1945, in order to afford the legislature an opportunity to study this subject and to enact suitable legislation concerning the problems involved.

It is my judgment that the situation which demanded the promulgation of the rule has not improved.

TAXATION

The 1½ percent gross income-tax rate established by section 2025b, Revised Laws of Hawaii, 1935, should be fixed permanently at 1½ percent.

I also recommend that the existing laws on the taxation of real property be amended so as to repeal all exemptions except as to repeal all exemptions except as to real property owned by the United States, the Territory, and its political subdivisions.

As I pointed out in my message to the twenty-second legislature, not only are such widespread exemptions undesirable and unjust to those individuals or organizations whose property is not exempt, but there is considerable doubt as to the legality of many of such exemptions under section 55 of the organic act.

Land should be valued for real property taxes every year, instead of every fourth year as at present.

The personal property tax base should be extended to include livestock and other animals.

Otherwise, I think no substantial changes should be made in the existing tax structure.

HAWAII DEFENSE ACT

The extraordinary powers granted the Governor by this act have been exercised with due regard to individual rights so far as possible in meeting the existing

problems. Copies of all Hawaii Defense Act rules and all important orders issued thereunder since my report to the twenty-second legislature will be submitted to each house of the legislature in the near future.

Before invoking controls endeavors were always made to consult with interested individuals with a view to working out the least objectionable and most effective forms of control. When the necessity for a rule has ceased, the rule has been promptly rescinded.

Though the military crisis which involved a threat of invasion by the enemy has long ceased to exist, the civilian emergency caused by shortages of transportation, food, material, labor, and other conditions is still acute, and in some ways even more so.

It is recommended that power be granted to enforce the Hawaii Defense Act by injunctive proceedings. The prevention of an evil is frequently much more to be desired than infliction of a penalty for causing it.

CIVILIAN DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

Since the outbreak of war many new territorial agencies were established to meet conditions existing from time to time affecting the security and welfare of our people.

Activity in this field has gradually diminished and controls have been relaxed or discontinued as conditions have warranted.

However, an obvious need exists for the continuation of many of these activities. Most of these have been financed with Federal funds made available to the Office of Civilian Defense shortly after Pearl Harbor. At the present time we have no assurance that such funds will continue to be available beyond the close of the current biennium. If assurance of continued Federal funds throughout the coming biennium are not forthcoming prior to your adjournment, I urge that you provide territorial funds sufficient to continue such of these activities as may be deemed reasonably necessary.

Voluntary participation in these activities has been widespread and wholehearted. I believe our citizens have gained new insight into the problems of government and highly valuable new views of our community obligations as they have given freely of their time and effort in aid of the common good.

HEALTH

In spite of the large increase in population, overcrowding and disruption of the established routine of living, Hawaii has been fortunate in maintaining its record as one of the world's healthiest communities, the last fiscal year having a new all-time low death rate, 6.1 per thousand of estimated civilian population.

This is the lowest death rate ever recorded for any State or Territory. In 17 out of 22 major causes of death, Hawaii is below the national average. The infant mortality and maternal mortality rates have reached an all-time low for Hawaii and have approached the figures of the best States in these regards.

The one dark spot in Hawaii's health record is tuberculosis. It is the Territory's most serious health problem.

There has been a substantial increase in the number of cases during the last 2 years. This may be due to overcrowding, particularly during the long black-out period which has recently been lifted, plus the strain of the war effort.

However, this increase, or at least part of it, may be more apparent than real as an expanded program and use of new equipment for the X-raying of food handlers and others resulted in the finding of many cases of infectious tuberculosis which might otherwise not have been discovered. In supporting the theory that there has been an actual increase in the rate as well as the number of cases, our death rate from tuberculosis has shown a slight increase between 1941 and 1944, rising from 53.3 per 100,000 population to 57.6 per 100,000.

This tuberculosis death rate exceeds the average on the mainland which is approximately 47. Many of our people are susceptible to tuberculosis and active cases exist in excess of available hospital facilities.

The tuberculosis problem is one affecting the welfare of the Territory as a whole and the Territory should meet the expenses of treatment and not leave it to the various counties.

I recommend that all tuberculosis hospitals throughout the Territory be taken over by the Territorial government and operated under the supervision of the board of health which now conducts all case-finding and preventive activities in this field.

This will permit transfer of patients from one institution to another, coordinate case-finding activities and treatment, and in many ways increase the efficiency of the hospitals.

In this connection, the public health and its problems are generally conceded to be of Territorial-wide scope and significance.

These problems cannot be effectively met if the administration in control and the financial responsibility are divided, or are vague and uncertain as between the Territory and the several county governments. Examples of such divided responsibility, in addition to the situation in connection with the tuberculosis hospitals pointed out above, are food inspection, direct medical and dental care to the needy, and the subsidization of such institutions as Palama Venereal Clinic. This should be corrected.

Though the health record of the Territory for the last 2 years was good, we have had several epidemics, fortunately soon curbed.

Dengue fever, which became epidemic in July 1943, was under control in October 1944, after 1,513 individuals were stricken. This control was largely due to a thoroughgoing mosquito eradication campaign conducted with the cooperation of the armed forces. The percentage of the total population contracting the disease was kept at a low figure; the deaths were only three.

The disease was probably brought here from the western Pacific, which emphasizes the necessity of protective measures, including embargoes against and quarantine of animals, designed to prevent air-borne passengers and freight from bringing into Hawaii human and other diseases which are prevalent in such regions.

Infantile paralysis was epidemic during the fiscal year 1942-43, resulting in 75 cases, none of which was fatal. Upon the outbreak of this epidemic, the OCD immediately established a hospital for all patients; this work was later taken over by the local Shriners, supported by local contributions.

In addition, there was an outbreak of bubonic plague in Honokaa. There were 12 cases and 12 deaths from March 1943, through July 1944. Upon the outbreak of the plague cases we inaugurated an intensive rat campaign, appropriating money from the OCD for such purpose. It has now been brought under control, the last case occurring July 22, 1944.

These epidemics are mentioned to show that eternal vigilance must be maintained, particularly in the control of rats, mosquitoes, and other disease-bearing pests, if we are to protect the health of the community from serious epidemics under wartime conditions.

In connection with the preventive measures it may be well to point out that, acting under the emergency powers given me by the M-day Act, I issued a rule requiring all persons in the Territory, not exempt by reason of age or physical conditions, to be vaccinated against smallpox and to be given booster shots of typhoid vaccine, the second since Pearl Harbor.

The case rate and death rate of typhoid after such vaccinations were one-tenth of the rate prior thereto. Chlorination of practically all supplies of potable water throughout the Territory doubtless was also an aid in prevention of typhoid.

EDUCATION

The department of public instruction has made substantial progress in the public-school program despite teacher shortages and the continued occupancy by the armed forces of certain of its school buildings. This continued occupancy by the Army of the Leilehua schools has caused the greatest difficulty.

Pursuant to my recommendation to the twenty-second legislature, kindergartens were established for the first time as a regular part of the public-school program. This service to the children of Hawaii should be expanded as rapidly as funds and qualified personnel are available.

Day-care centers have also been established to care for the children of mothers engaged in essential industries. This development has been of great aid to the war effort.

Participation by older pupils in the Governor's work-to-win campaign resulted in the supplying of 6,879,198 hours of student labor for the cultivation and harvesting of vital food crops. Students have also participated in other types of community cooperation such as victory gardening, salvage campaigns, mosquito control work and Red Cross and hospital work.

I desire to repeat the recommendations made by me to the twenty-second legislature that the residence requirement for the appointment of teachers in the public schools should be removed.

There are many disadvantages to an inbred school system, particularly in an isolated community where so many of the pupils are children of alien parents. Furthermore, we must bear in mind that the schools exist for the benefit of the pupils and not the teachers; moreover, we believe that the young people of the Territory are able to meet any outside competition and do not need any such restrictive provisions.

PLAN FOR UNIVERSITY DEVELOPMENT

The University of Hawaii has laid out a plan for future development. Immediate acquisition of lands adjoining its grounds should be made forthwith for the development of the university's agricultural, housing, and athletic programs. Existing plans call for the construction of dormitories to accommodate ultimately 1,500 students. I recommend that dormitories be provided as soon as possible for 300 students.

Such dormitories, in addition to furnishing shelter to the individual students, will be an invaluable aid to the education and culture of these students.

The university has undertaken, in cooperation with the Territorial Board of Agriculture and Forestry, a fisheries research project which should eventually prove of great value to the Territory.

LANDS FOR HOMES

The great land-holding monopolies which exist in this Territory have resulted, especially on Oahu, in an artificial shortage and unhealthy increase in the value of lands available for residences—so extreme as to render impracticable any scheme for adequate housing with private capital unless and until sufficient lands at reasonable prices for new buildings can be made available.

In my opinion the present city of Honolulu proper has reached the saturation point so far as available lands for this purpose are concerned, and no substantial relief can be anticipated unless the Territory acts to acquire through the power of eminent domain additional land areas for subdivision and sale for residential purposes.

I, therefore, recommend the creation of a public corporation or agency authorized to acquire private lands by purchase or condemnation on the island of Oahu, to borrow funds for that purpose, and to subdivide, improve and sell such lands for residential purposes, with adequate planning for schools, parks, playgrounds, business areas, etc., to serve such new subdivisions. Detail of this proposed project, as well as of proposed emergency housing, will be submitted to you later with a suggested draft of proposed legislation to accomplish the desired results.

WATER RESOURCES

Our ground water resources, particularly on the island of Oahu, are a priceless asset which must be protected and conserved for the broadest possible use and benefit.

There have been vast increases in the use of such water in recent years. It is obvious that uncontrolled use of the available supply may bring serious danger. Last fall I obtained for the board of water supply the services of Mr. Wells A. Hutchins, of the United States Department of Agriculture; he has given us valuable information on our water situation and has suggested legislative remedies.

Legislation to protect the ground water supply will be submitted to you and I recommend your earnest consideration of this measure.

Also, Territorial control of watersheds is essential in Honolulu. The present watershed responsible for our supply of underground water is largely in private ownership and therefore not only subject to reduction by withdrawal from such status, but also may not be properly forested by governmental authorities. The title to all necessary land should be recovered by the Territory at as early a date as possible.

AGRICULTURE

Our board of commissioners of agriculture and forestry has given valuable assistance in increasing the production of food.

Small farming has been encouraged and aided in many ways and the future looks encouraging. Legislation should be passed to protect these farmers through standardization and marketing laws. Most of the States have laws designed to provide for the orderly marketing, grading, and labeling of farm produce.

INSTITUTIONS

Our institutions, as other Territorial departments, have been greatly handicapped by manpower shortages.

Serious overcrowding continues to exist at the Territorial Hospital for the mentally ill and plans should be made to provide additional beds at this institution.

One of our must programs is the extension of facilities at the Waialeale Training School for Boys. Juvenile delinquency has reached alarming proportions in Hawaii.

The present facilities at Waialeale are hopelessly inadequate. In this connection, no further capital expenditures should be made at the present location of the Boys' Training School; the school should be moved to a place where there is more opportunity for expansion. I recommend that a new site be obtained at Maunawili.

I further suggest that our entire penal system and facilities be studied and modernized. The present location of Oahu penitentiary, in the heart of Honolulu, and its limited area, render the site unsuitable for its purpose. We should have a large farming area of at least 2,000 acres.

It is also suggested that all jails be placed under the jurisdiction of the department of institutions.

FINANCING OF DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE

At the present time the revenue for the department of public welfare is derived from the receipts from the compensation and dividends tax. Since this tax is levied on wages and dividends, the revenues increase in times of prosperity, at a time the demands upon the welfare department decrease, but in times of unemployment when the demands on the welfare department are greatest, the revenues from the tax decrease.

I suggest, therefore, that consideration be given to the desirability of financing the department of public welfare by a direct appropriation from the general fund, instead of out of a special tax.

PUBLIC WORKS

Although a grave need exists for capital improvements which will place the various agencies of the Territorial government in a position to render better service, it is not anticipated that the coming biennium will afford many opportunities to embark on new construction involving the extensive use of men and materials. Also, it should not be forgotten that, in an era of mounting maintenance costs, deferred expenditures, creating a maintenance backlog, have contributed very substantially to the existing surplus.

However, a substantial portion of our surplus might well be set aside for the immediate acquisition of lands which will be required in connection with such projects as you may approve, and a further substantial sum should be set aside as a reserve for expenditure for deferred maintenance and for actual construction work at such time as such work will provide the greatest possible public benefit.

I recommend that the Territorial planning board be reactivated, or that some similar agency be set up, to take over the duties, responsibilities and functions of the postwar planning division set up by me under the Hawaii Defense Act.

It is essential that such a body be given sufficient authority and funds to effectively coordinate all governmental planning by the Territory and its political subdivisions and to prepare adequate plans and specifications for prompt commencement of construction when appropriate.

LABOR AND INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

As our islands' economy approaches a return to a peacetime basis, it becomes increasingly important that our laws relating to labor and industrial relations be modernized. The benefits of the unemployment compensation and workmen's compensation laws may well be extended and enlarged. The child labor and the wages and hours and apprenticeship laws should be studied with a view to increasing the scope of their protection and benefits.

Proposed legislation, which will keep Hawaii well in the vanguard of the most advanced and enlightened thought on these subjects has been prepared by the Territorial department of labor and industrial relations and will be presented for your consideration.

AIRPORT ZONING

Hawaii will be the distributing center of air-borne travel and commerce in the Pacific and plans to meet our opportunities and obligations in this field should not be delayed. An airport zoning statute should be enacted.

COURTS AND SALARIES OF TERRITORIAL JUDGES

I again suggest for your consideration the matter of relieving both the counties and the circuit courts of the burdens incident to the existing system where the operation of such courts are financed by the county governments. The circuit courts are units of the judicial branch of the Territorial government; their only connection with the county governments lies on their dependence upon such governments for their operating funds and for their civil-service personnel.

In this connection attention is called to the insufficient compensation now being paid to judicial officers of the Territory whose compensation is fixed by the Federal Government. A study might also be made of the salaries of federally paid legislative and executive officers of the Territory whose salaries are inadequate, and a recommendation made to the Congress.

LEGISLATION BENEFICIAL TO OUR CITIZENS SERVING IN THE ARMED FORCES

I recommend enactment of legislation in the form approved by the Council of State Governments and the War Department relating to acknowledgments and other notarial acts made by commissioned officers and the conservation of the assets of missing military personnel.

COUNTIES

A number of proposals which I have made to you for the primary purpose of strengthening and centralizing the administration of certain governmental functions now administered and financed wholly or in part by the several counties will, if adopted, serve to relieve the counties of substantial financial burdens, many of which are mandated by existing laws.

In addition, my proposal to liquidate as much as possible of the Territorial debt with existing surplus funds will relieve the counties of substantial annual debt charges.

The moneys thus saved to the county governments will enable them better to meet their obligations in discharging the duties which they are legally bound to assume.

The ability of these political subdivisions of the Territory to finance out of current revenues any presently urgent or postwar capital improvements and their borrowing capacity for such purposes also should be improved.

If the proposals above referred to are carried out, the resulting financial condition of each county should be carefully studied before direct grants out of Territorial general revenues are made for specific projects sponsored by such county.

On the other hand, each of the county governments should be allowed the fullest possible autonomy consistent with sound governmental practice in the determination of the specific objects and purposes for which it will make expenditures of its own funds.

CONCLUSION

During the three years of war the loyalty of the citizens of this Territory of every racial origin has been proved beyond any shadow of doubt. Our citizens have stood second to none, whether on the fighting front, in the purchase of war bonds, in war work, or the observance of emergency restrictions. They have not been found wanting. They have met and overcome challenges to their rights to constitutional self-government.

With this record behind us, we shall go forward strong in the confidence that we can meet our responsibilities as citizens of an American State. You, in the session of the legislature now opening, have the opportunity of giving additional proof of Hawaii's capacity for the conduct of an enlightened, progressive government that will put us one step nearer the ultimate and merited goal of statehood.

INGRAM M. STAINBACK,
Governor of Hawaii.

EXHIBIT 18. PRESENTED BY ROY A. VITOUSEK

RESOLUTION OF THE TERRITORIAL CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY OF HAWAII

Whereas the Republican Party of the Territory of Hawaii has over a long period of time endorsed and approved Hawaii being admitted as a State in the Union of the United States; and

Whereas Hawaii has fulfilled every requirement for statehood heretofore exacted for Territories; and

Whereas Hawaii's devotion to democratic principles, the patriotism and loyalty of its people and the high development of its resources and its record in such matters as it has been granted self-government entitles it to statehood; and

Whereas there is about to visit the Territory of Hawaii a subcommittee of the Committee on Territories of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States to hold hearings, among other matters, upon the question of statehood: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Territorial Central Committee of the Republican Party of the Territory of Hawaii, That it again endorse statehood for Hawaii and that it earnestly and sincerely request Congress to pass an enabling act giving Hawaii statehood.

I, Roy A. Vitousek, chairman, do hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was unanimously adopted by the Territorial Central Committee of the Republican Party of Hawaii at a meeting duly noticed, called and held January 2, 1946.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hands this 5th day of January 1946.

ROY A. VITOUSEK, *Chairman.*

EXHIBIT 20. PRESENTED BY THE HAWAII EQUAL RIGHTS COMMISSION

PARTICIPATION IN USO ACTIVITIES

UNITED SERVICE ORGANIZATIONS, INC.,
OVERSEAS DEPARTMENT,
TERRITORIAL HEADQUARTERS,

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,

Honolulu, T. H.

Honolulu 1, T. H., January 4, 1946.

(Attention: Mr. Ronald Jamieson.)

DEAR MR. JAMIESON: Complying with your request that we furnish you information to be presented the Commission To Study the Possibility of Statehood for Hawaii, I am glad to give you the following figures: Number of local participants in volunteer capacities in the Territory of Hawaii, 7,918; number of persons employed from local sources in the Territory, 740.

As regards the contributions to USO from local persons; in checking with my business department I learned that these will be included in the material furnished you by Mr. Arthur Eyles, of the community chest.

It is rather unsatisfactory to present this material just as figures, as the USO in the Territory of Hawaii has had the complete cooperation and assistance of persons from every walk of life and has represented a truly democratic organization.

Perhaps you would be interested in copies of the annual reports to supplement the figures furnished you.

If I can be of any further service I shall be very glad to have you call on me.

Sincerely yours,

Alice H. Cooke,
Director, USO, Territory of Hawaii.

EXHIBIT 21. PRESENTED BY THE HAWAII EQUAL RIGHTS COMMISSION

CONTRIBUTIONS TO COMMUNITY CHEST AND WAR FUND

HAWAII EQUAL RIGHTS COMMISSION,

Care of Attorney General's Office, Honolulu, T. H.

HONOLULU COMMUNITY CHEST,

January 4, 1946.

GENTLEMEN: In response to a request received from Mr. Ronald B. Jamieson we are pleased to submit the following information concerning the support of

local, national, and international health and welfare services given by the people of Oahu through the medium of fund-raising campaigns conducted over the past few years under the auspices of the Honolulu Community Chest and the Hawaii Committee of the National War Fund:

1941.—In the fall of 1941 the people of Oahu accepted a goal of \$575,000, \$528,000 of which was for the support of local health and welfare services and \$47,000 as Oahu's contribution to the support of USO. This campaign raised approximately \$613,000 of which \$590,000 originated with the permanent community on this island and approximately \$23,000 from the personnel and civilian employees of the Army and Navy stationed here. Approximately 1,000 people took part in the conduct of this campaign and the total amount was raised as a result of more than 150,000 individual subscriptions.

1942.—The goal on Oahu in this year was \$600,000, made up of \$100,000 for the USO and \$500,000 for the support of local services. It is interesting to note that with the very upset conditions which prevailed here during the year 1942 that the campaign was oversubscribed by approximately one-third, which means that about \$800,000 was raised. Everyone in the community was extremely busy during this period and it is probable that 900 of our citizens took part in this effort. In this campaign the personnel and civilian employees of the Army and Navy accounted for approximately \$116,000 of the total raised.

1943.—In January of this year, at the request of President Roosevelt, a group of national leaders organized what we now know as the National War Fund for the purpose of bringing together in one appeal support for services to the armed forces and assistance to our allies. The people of Hawaii voluntarily assumed a Territorial quota in support of this effort in the amount of \$390,000 of which Oahu assumed responsibility for \$300,000. Realizing that there would be tremendous needs in the Philippines at such time as it was possible to render assistance the people of Hawaii took the lead in establishing the Philippine war relief fund which was registered by the President's War Relief Control Board and certified by the Board for admission to the National War Fund. The Oahu goal for this campaign consisted of \$600,000 for local agencies' services, \$300,000 as above noted for the National War Fund and \$25,000 for Philippine war relief. This goal was oversubscribed by approximately \$117,000 showing a total amount raised of about \$1,042,000. Approximately 1,250 people took part in the conduct of the campaign and while it is impossible to accurately determine the number of contributors due to the necessity of security measures surrounding personnel and civilians employed by the armed forces, it is safe to say that in excess of 170,000 individual contributions were received.

1944.—The Oahu goal in the fall of 1941 was \$940,000, made up of \$664,000 for local needs and \$276,000 for the support of the agencies of the National War Fund. Again the campaign exceeded its quota with a total amount raised of approximately \$997,000. Approximately 1,500 local people devoted time and energy to the conduct of this campaign which secured subscriptions from more than 145,000 different sources.

1945.—The local goal of the campaign recently completed was \$935,000, representing \$700,000 for local services and \$235,000 for the National War Fund. Due to a number of circumstances coincident to the ending of the war it was impossible to reach the established goal and as of this date approximately \$834,000 has been subscribed. The major reduction in subscriptions in this campaign over the one immediately prior resulted from a tremendous decrease in the personnel and civilian employees of the War and the Navy Departments with a resultant reduction in the subscriptions from these forces of more than \$117,000.

National War Fund.—In the establishment of its national goal the National War Fund did not include any assigned quota for the Territory of Hawaii. It has been traditional that Hawaii has always wanted to accept its fair share of responsibility for the support of necessary services to the members of our armed forces and for relief and assistance to our friends throughout the world. With this tradition in mind, the people of Hawaii voluntarily assumed a quota for the support of the agencies of the National War Fund which compared favorably with the regularly assigned quotas of the 48 States and the District of Columbia. With the exception of this recent campaign, Hawaii has contributed an amount considerably in excess of its originally agreed and voluntarily assumed quotas.

Philippine war relief clothing campaign.—Shortly after American forces had landed in the Philippines the people of Hawaii wished to take some concrete steps to express their friendship for our Pacific neighbors far to our west. Through the medium of the Philippine war relief fund, which had been organized in

Hawaii in 1943 and using the Community Chest resources on each of the islands, more than a half million individual garments were collected, sorted, repaired when necessary, packed and shipped to the Philippines. The expressions of gratitude which have been received as a result of this effort have more than amply repaid our people for the time, energy and effort that was put into this enterprise.

I trust that the information above supplied will be of assistance to the Commission in connection with their effort to secure equal rights for the people of our islands.

Sincerely,

ARTHUR H. EYLES 3d, *Manager.*

EXHIBIT 22. PRESENTED BY THE HAWAII EQUAL RIGHTS COMMISSION

PARTICIPATION IN RED CROSS WORK

AMERICAN RED CROSS,
January 7, 1946.

EQUAL RIGHTS COMMISSION,

Care of Attorney General, Honolulu, T. H.

GENTLEMEN: We set forth below annual contributions in these islands to the American Red Cross:

1942-----	\$163, 000	1944-----	\$474, 000
1943-----	591, 000	1945-----	629, 000

With the exception of a skeleton force in the Administration office all Hawaii Chapter work was handled by volunteers. The number of volunteers during the past 4 years has been 15,000. These people are from all walks of life and of all races represented in the islands.

Yours very truly,

J. HOWARD ELLIS, *Executive Director.*

EXHIBIT 26. PRESENTED BY NILS P. LARSEN, M. D.

LIST OF THE TERRITORIAL DOCTORS WHO SERVED WITH THE ARMED FORCES DURING WORLD WAR II (FROM A NEWSPAPER ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE HONOLULU COUNTY MEDICAL SOCIETY)

Emory H. Anderson
Robert F. Bailey
Morton E. Berk
Alfred J. Burden
T. Alan Casey
H. M. Chandler
H. C. Chang
Archie Chun Ming
E. K. Chung Hoon
Phillip M. Corboy
Thomas W. Cowan
D. S. Depp
Richard Durant
Raymond Dusendschon
A. M. Ecklund
R. B. Faus
John M. Felix
James F. Fleming
Clarence Fronk
F. L. Giles
Rogers Lee Hill
Louis Hirsch

Robert Hunter
Edmund Ing
W. S. Ito
Richard Kainuma
Lester Kashiwa
Robert Katsuki
I. A. Kawasaki
Wallace Kawaoka
E. K. S. Lau
J. F. C. Lau
Leslie Luke
Walter F. Macklin
R. J. Mansfield
Colin C. McCorriston
J. McClellan
R. J. Mermod
R. D. Millard
Thomas N. Mossman
Douglas Murray
Joseph Palma
David L. Pang
A. Sumner Price

O. D. Pinkerton
Harold M. Sexton
R. S. Steffe
Carl Tessmer
F. W. Thompson
C. W. Trexler
Fook Hing Tong
Volt H. Tom¹
Leslie Vasconcelles
B. O. Wade
Arnold Wagner
Garton E. Wall
W. M. Walsh
J. E. Walther
F. B. Warshauer
R. T. West
Paul Wiig
C. L. Wilbar, Jr.
Paul Withington
James T. S. Wong
Richard Won Sang You
Lester P. K. Yee

¹ Killed in action in Guadalcanal.

EXHIBIT 31. PRESENTED BY THE HAWAII EQUAL RIGHTS COMMISSION

SELECTIVE SERVICE REJECTIONS ON ACCOUNT OF ILLITERACY AND
OTHER CAUSES

SELECTIVE SERVICE,
OFFICE TERRITORIAL DIRECTOR,
Honolulu, T. H., 12, January 8, 1946.

Memo to: Hawaii Equal Rights Commission, care of attorney general's office,
Territory of Hawaii.

From: Maj. Lake E. Bellinger, deputy director.

In furtherance of our telephone conversation yesterday afternoon, the following figures from the best information available from our records are submitted for your information:

Total registrants examined on Oahu in 1945----- 17,280
Total rejected (all reasons, mental and physical)----- 2,560

Total registrants acceptable to the armed forces, including illiterates- 14,720

Of the 2,560 men rejected, 66 were for mental deficiency (including morons and imbeciles). These rejections account for 2.6 percent of the total rejections in the Territory of Hawaii for 1945, as compared with similar rejections on the mainland in 1944 (latest available mainland figures) of 2.8 percent.

Three hundred and sixty-seven of the 2,560 rejectees were because of mental diseases, such as: psychosis, psychopathic personality, psychoneurosis, and other psychiatric defects. These cases accounted for 14 percent of the total rejections in the Territory as contrasted to 29.2 percent on the mainland (1944 figures).

One thousand two hundred and thirty-nine of the 17,280 examined were classified as illiterates principally because of educational deficiency. These cases were acceptable to the armed forces as long as it did not exceed 10 percent of the total number of inductees per month. The percentage of such cases in Hawaii is 7.2 percent as contrasted to 10.6 percent on the mainland (1944 figures).

If the so-called illiterates acceptable for services in the armed forces and the mental deficiency cases are considered as a single cause of rejection, it would show the following figures:

Hawaii (1945)	Mainland (1944)
7.2	10.6
2.6	2.8
9.8	13.4

It is not fair to say that the figures for Hawaii are exactly comparable to those on the mainland because the mainland figures are approximately 1 year older than those used for Hawaii, due to the fact that the mainland figures for 1945 are not available. Another factor bearing upon this problem is that the age group examined in Hawaii in 1945 was considerably younger in 1945 than those examined on the mainland in 1944. As all factors are considered, it is reasonable to assume that the illiteracy rate in the Territory of Hawaii is comparable to such cases on the mainland.

It is hoped that the above information will be of some value to you despite the fact that it is impossible for us to give you exact cases in Hawaii that are comparable to those existing on the mainland at the same time. It should be remembered that the operation of selective service in Hawaii was somewhat delayed in the early stage of the war, and that we have continually operated on a slightly different basis.

LAKE E. BELLINGER,
Major, AUS, Deputy Director,
Territorial Headquarters, Selective Service System.

EXHIBIT 32. PRESENTED BY THE HAWAII EQUAL RIGHTS COMMISSION

LISTS OF FOREIGN-LANGUAGE NEWSPAPERS

TERRITORY OF HAWAII,
BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF PUBLIC ARCHIVES,
Honolulu, January 8, 1946.

The HAWAIIAN EQUAL RIGHTS COMMISSION,
Care of Mr. Dudley C. Lewis,
Office of the Attorney General, Iolani Palace, Honolulu.

GENTLEMEN: The enclosed two lists of foreign-language newspapers have been compiled from the newspaper files in the public archives, the former office of the military governor, Filipino and Korean Societies, the 1941-42 Directory, and from residents of foreign ancestry.

The 1941-42 list is, so far as can be checked, complete. The 1945-46 list may have omissions as there has not been time in which to check with the outside islands.

In addition there were two magazines published in Filipino dialect in 1941, the Rizal Journal and Ti Manangipadamag.

Respectfully,

MAUDE JONES, *Archivist.*

FOREIGN-LANGUAGE NEWSPAPERS PUBLISHED IN THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII, 1941-42

Hawaii Hochi, the, daily, Japanese-English, Honolulu.
Hawaii Shimpō, weekly, Japanese-English, Honolulu.
Jitsugyo-No-Hawaii, weekly, Japanese-English, Honolulu.
Korean Christian Herald, Korean, Honolulu.
Korean National Herald, weekly, Korean, Honolulu.
Korean Pacific Weekly, Korean, Honolulu.
Liberty News, Chinese triweekly, Chinese, Honolulu.
New China Daily Press, triweekly, Chinese, Honolulu.
Nippu Jiji, daily, Japanese-English, Honolulu.
Philippine Commonwealth Chronicle, weekly, Filipino-English, Honolulu.
Ti Silaw, weekly, Filipino-English, Honolulu.
United Chinese News, triweekly, Chinese, Honolulu.
Hawaii Mainichi, the, Japanese-English, Hilo, Hawaii.
Kwazan, the, daily, Japanese, Hilo, Hawaii.
Maui Shinbun, the, Japanese-English, Wailuku, Maui.
Shin Jidai, the, weekly, Japanese, Paia, Maui.
Filipino News, weekly, Filipino, Lihue, Kauai.
Kauai Shinpo, weekly, Japanese-English, Lihue, Kauai.
Yoen Jiho, weekly, Japanese, Hanapepe, Kauai.

SUPPLEMENTARY LIST 1941-42, FOREIGN-LANGUAGE NEWSPAPERS PUBLISHED IN THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII

(Not included in first list)

Maui Record, semi-weekly, Japanese-English, Wailuku, Maui.
Kona Echo, Japanese-English, Kona, Hawaii.
Hawaii Chinese Journal, weekly, Chinese-English, Honolulu.
Hawaii Mikkyo, Japanese.
The Independent, Japanese-English, Hilo, Hawaii.

MAGAZINES

The Tulang News, monthly, Filipino-English, Hilo, Hawaii.
The Buddhist Child, semimonthly, Japanese-English, Honolulu.
The Dobo English Section, monthly, Japanese-English, Honolulu.

FOREIGN-LANGUAGE NEWSPAPERS PUBLISHED IN THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII, 1945-46

Filipino Work to Win and War Bond Bulletin, monthly, Filipino, Honolulu.
Hawaii Herald, the, daily, Japanese-English, Honolulu.
Hawaii Times, daily, Japanese-English, Honolulu.
Korean National Herald, weekly, Korean, Honolulu.

New China Daily Press, daily, Chinese, Honolulu.
 Plantation Hi Lights, monthly, Filipino-English, Honolulu.
 United Chinese News, daily, Chinese, Honolulu.
 Wagayway, monthly, Filipino, Honolulu.
 Filipino News, weekly, Filipino, Lihue, Kauai.

EXHIBIT 33. PRESENTED BY NEWTON R. HOLCOMB

Estimated employment, Territory of Hawaii, by islands, Jan. 1, 1946

	Total	Oahu	Hawaii	Maui	Kauai
Total, all industries.....	194,025	144,780	23,380	15,220	10,645
Government.....	65,000	58,680	2,630	2,370	1,320
U. S. Army.....	25,000	24,150	400	150	300
U. S. Navy.....	25,500	24,600	200	700	0
Non civil service Army and Navy.....	1,700	1,630	30	20	20
All other.....	12,800	8,300	2,000	1,500	1,000
Private industry.....	106,050	68,100	18,050	11,450	8,450
Sugar plantations.....	24,500	4,900	9,600	4,700	5,300
Pineapple (agriculture only).....	4,750	1,450	0	2,700	600
Other agriculture.....	7,400	3,500	2,950	650	300
Construction and quarrying.....	6,600	6,300	200	50	50
Manufacturing, except sugar.....	11,300	9,950	300	600	450
Transportation, commodities and utilities.....	10,700	9,000	800	500	500
Wholesale and retail trades.....	23,000	18,400	2,500	1,250	850
Finance, insurance, and real estate.....	3,000	2,800	100	50	50
Service industries.....	13,500	10,900	1,400	800	400
Miscellaneous, not elsewhere classified (includes fishing).....	1,300	900	200	150	50
Domestic service.....	4,075	2,500	600	500	475
Self-employed, agents, individually operated, family owned and operated establishments (not elsewhere classified).....	18,900	15,500	2,100	900	400

¹ Excludes 4,017 children working part time.

² Excludes members of family.

Prepared by Reports and Analysis Division, U. S. Employment Service, Jan. 5, 1946.

EXHIBIT 34. PRESENTED BY JACK W. HALL

CIO POSITION WITH RESPECT TO IMPORTATION OF FILIPINO LABOR AS OF
JANUARY 3, 1946

JANUARY 3, 1946.

HON. INGRAM M. STAINBACK,

*Governor, Territory of Hawaii,**Iolani Palace, Honolulu, T. H.*

DEAR SIR: This will acknowledge your letter of December 27, 1945, in re your order permitting the importation of 6,000 Filipino laborers. The letter was referred to the Territorial ILWU Policy Committee for reply and we are pleased to comment on your questions as follows:

1. *What has been the effect of the end of hostilities on the labor supply and the prospect of securing a solution of the labor shortage without resorting to labor recruitment from abroad?*

Since the end of the war, we have noted a sharp reduction in the workweek on practically all sugar plantations. Plantations formerly offering employees as much as 72 hours work per week have cut job opportunities to 48 hours and less. The Oahu Sugar Co. at Waipahu is an example.

These reduced workweeks may be attributed to three reasons: (a) The desire of the employers, particularly in field operations, to eliminate insofar as possible premium overtime work; (b) new accessions to the industry which are definitely

on the upgrade; (c) reduced workweeks magnify any existing labor shortage and lend support for importation.

We believe any current labor shortage can be met by employing present employees for longer workweeks.

It is not the desire of the ILWU to encourage abnormally long workweeks as a permanent practice. However, to meet any existing emergency and to guard against creating labor surpluses in Hawaii present employees are willing to help.

We conservatively estimate that it will cost at least \$500 to import and return each agricultural laborer. That means that importation will cost local industry in the neighborhood of \$3,000,000.

Computing the average wage in the industry at, say 60 cents per hour, the above sum would meet the extra premium cost of working 10,000,000 hours. Present employees could work that time by putting in 10 extra hours each week. Surely 10,000,000 hours additional work during the next year would meet any labor shortage in agricultural employment.

2. What number of the agricultural laborers that left for military and industrial employment connected with the war may be expected to return to the plantations as a result of the demobilization of the Hawaiians in the armed service?

Most former agricultural workers left the plantations during 1940 and 1941 because of extremely low pay rates in comparison with job opportunities in the defense period. During the war separations were comparatively few, except for voluntary military enlistments, because of selective service deferments and the labor "freeze" both under martial law and "Hawaiian style" deviation from national war manpower regulations.

Since termination of the war and the lifting of all manpower controls, separations have been at a minimum. This is primarily true because wage rates and working conditions improved materially in the sugar industry with the signing of union agreements some 4 months ago. Workers in the industry expect conditions to improve further over a period of time because of their union.

However, a considerable number of former employees are returning to the sugar industry. Veterans upon discharge—and after they have taken a few months well-deserved rest—are going back to work in Hawaii's basic industries. We believe both sugar and pineapple should submit up-to-date employment figures showing new hires and returning former employees or veterans at once. This will confirm our view.

Much emphasis has been placed on large percentage decreases in agricultural or field employment in contrast to a less marked decrease in mill and industrial employment. These percentages are grossly misleading. It is the mechanization and rationalization of operations that has brought such a marked reduction in the number of field workers.

Production figures in relation of employment is a much better guide. Sugar with a pay roll covering 54,000 workers in 1932 produced slightly in excess of 1,000,000 tons of sugar. During 1945 with little more than 20,000 adult workers it is producing nearly 800,000 tons—with a considerable portion of its most productive fields appropriated for military use.

3. What effect, if any, has the release of workers from nonagricultural employment had upon the supply of agricultural labor and what changes in the demand and supply of agricultural labor may be expected in the next 2 years?

We are of the opinion that there will be a marked decrease in the demand for agricultural labor during the next 2 years. The best evidence of this is the recent session of scientists at the HSPA Experiment Station where new methods of mechanization projected for the immediate future were discussed and which will be introduced as materials and equipment become available.

While the release of workers from nonagricultural employment, particularly from war jobs, has not yet had an overwhelming effect on the supply of agricultural labor, the trend is clear. It will continue to mount as savings are depleted and employment with security becomes more difficult to obtain in nonagricultural employment. That it will so become with the mass lay-off projected in military employment is a sound conclusion.

4. *What number of Filipinos now working on plantations expect to return to the Philippine Islands, and has any effort been made to determine such number that may return to the Philippines?*

A year ago sentiment was extremely strong among Filipino workers to return to the Philippines. This was at a time when the Philippines were being liberated—emotion was strong, as was the desire to learn of their families, friends, and property. Coupled with this was the fact that wages and working conditions in sugar were relatively low, prospects were dim for the future, and the Philippines beckoned as a chance to make a new start.

Today our survey shows that the average Filipino worker wants to remain in Hawaii—his home for the past 15 or 20 years. He wants to keep and improve his job and pay rates. He has little desire to work for 2 pesos a day in an impoverished country.

5. *Of those that intend to leave the islands for the Philippines, is it to visit their families or secure employment in the Philippines?*

It is primarily to visit families that workers intend to leave the islands. They are prompted, however, to make these trips by financial reasons as well as emotional ones. Many of them are members of the so-called "going home" society and have been contributing large sums into them for many years. And it is only by "going home" that they are able to get any return on their contributions.

If the society could be "prevailed" upon by Government officials to permit contributors to withdraw their contributions without the necessity for "going home," we are of the opinion that departures would be considerably decreased.

In addition, many are entitled to transportation to the Philippines at HSPA expense as a consequence of completing their contracts of employment. A cash settlement could be made in many of these cases.

6. *Are the Filipinos dissatisfied with working and living conditions in the Hawaiian plantations?*

Yes; as are practically all other workers. The dissatisfaction is not near as great as it was a year ago.

7. *If so, will the effect be to replace them by newcomers who will become similarly dissatisfied?*

No. We do not expect present conditions on plantations will remain status quo. Workers on plantations, through their unions, will continue striving for improved wages, working conditions, and living conditions. Their experience during the last 6 months gives promise of their ability to make such improvements. It is our opinion that, by and large, present plantation employees will continue to remain on plantations and that new employees will become permanent employees.

8. *Is it necessary and possible to take any steps to improve living conditions and treatment of Filipinos in Hawaii as inducing those already resident to remain?*

Very definitely, yes.

(a) The basic industries could make a public pronouncement on what they plan to do in concrete terms in order to encourage workers of all races to remain on plantations. What do they intend to do about deplorable housing and miserable sanitation? Of course, it is not possible to correct all bad conditions in a single day, but what do they intend specifically in 1946? 1947?

(b) The Government and the employers could jointly undertake to encourage and permit the immigration of the wives and prospective wives of present workers, in order to make them satisfied, normal, and permanent workers in the industries they have contributed so much to build.

We hope that the above information will be of value to you and explain our opposition to the importation of any labor at this time. Hawaii in the throes of leveling off from a wartime to a peacetime economy. Immigration is certain to aggravate our economy when it is leveled off.

The only area of disagreement is around the time that leveling off will be reached. Some people may have the opinion that section 8 (f) of your order permitting you to determine when a surplus of agricultural labor is available in Hawaii and thus terminate the contracts of the imported laborers is sufficient protection to the Territory. We do not agree.

Once legally in Hawaii, we do not expect the newly imported laborers are going to be too anxious to return to the economy and living standards of Luzon villages. People who think so are selling Hawaii and its good features short.

In conclusion, we wish to draw particular emphasis to the fact that the workers who left agricultural employment during the last 7 years did not evaporate. They are still in the islands or in uniform and will soon be returning. When our economy has leveled off, there is certain to be a residue of former agricultural workers who will be available for agricultural work.

Sincerely yours,

TERRITORIAL ILWU POLICY COMMITTEE,
JACK W. HALL, *Regional Director*.

EXHIBIT 35. PRESENTED BY ROBERT H. LLOYD

Kamehameha Homes—Racial extraction of families living in project

1. Caucasian	22
(a) Haoles	2
(b) Portuguese	12
(c) Portuguese-Caucasian	5
(d) Portuguese-Spanish	2
(e) Caucasian-Spanish	1
2. Chinese	8
3. Hawaiian	7
4. Korean	17
5. Filipino	24
6. Japanese	30
7. Puerto Rican	13
8. Chinese-Hawaiian	26
9. Chinese-Hawaiian-Caucasian	9
10. Chinese-Hawaiian-Negro	1
11. Chinese-Hawaiian-Filipino	2
12. Chinese-Hawaiian-Korean	3
13. Chinese-Hawaiian-Japanese	2
14. Chinese-Puerto Rican	1
15. Chinese-Japanese	2
16. Chinese-Caucasian-Filipino	1
17. Chinese-Caucasian	1
18. Caucasian-Hawaiian	11
19. Caucasian-Filipino	2
20. Caucasian-Negro-Puerto Rican	1
21. Caucasian-Hawaiian-Japanese	3
22. Caucasian-Korean	3
23. Caucasian-Hawaiian-Filipino	3
24. Filipino-Puerto Rican	2
25. Filipino-Japanese	1
26. Filipino-Korean	2
27. Filipino-Hawaiian	6
28. Filipino-Mexican-Hawaiian	1
29. Filipino-Hawaiian-Puerto Rican	1
30. Filipino-Hawaiian-Japanese	1
31. Puerto Rican-Caucasian	5
32. Puerto Rican-Korean	1
33. Korean-Hawaiian	2
34. Korean-Japanese	4
35. Hawaiian-Japanese	1
36. Hawaiian-Italian-Mexican	1
37. Puerto Rican-Hawaiian	1
Total	221

EXHIBIT 36A, PRESENTED BY A. LESTER MARKS

Areas in acres of all lands in the Territory of Hawaii by approximate ownership and utilization, Dec. 31, 1945

(See also exhibits 43 and 44 containing schedules of private ownerships and exhibit 80 relating to land owned by the Federal Government)

[Augmenting and correcting tables appearing on p. 86 of Report of Investigation and Study of the Subject of Statehood and Other Subjects Relating to the Welfare of the Territory of Hawaii, made by Joint Committee on Hawaii pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 18, S. Doc. 151]

A. Federal agencies.....	226, 870
1. U. S. Army.....	33, 290
2. U. S. Navy.....	28, 590
3. National parks.....	164, 205
4. Other.....	785
B. Public lands, including Hawaiian homes.....	1, 535, 180
5. Agricultural.....	40, 090
(a) Sugarcane leases ¹	34, 390
(b) Pineapple leases ²	3, 200
(c) Other leases ³	2,500
6. Pasture leases, all classes.....	510, 780
7. Homesteads and houselots.....	19, 770
8. Business property.....	525
9. Reservations for public purposes.....	21, 375
10. Forest reserves.....	681, 705
11. Highways, unleased and waste.....	260, 935
C. Privately owned lands.....	2, 356, 350
12. Agricultural.....	288, 165
(a) Sugarcane ⁴	201, 965
(1) Owned by plantations.....	130, 250
(2) Leased from others.....	71, 715
(b) Pineapple ²	61, 200
(1) Owned by plantations.....	21, 060
(2) Leased from others.....	40,140
(c) Other ³	25, 000
13. Pasture, all classes.....	840, 210
(a) Owned by ranchers.....	671, 240
(b) Leased from private owners.....	168, 970
14. Forest reserves.....	363, 380
15. Cities, towns, and waste.....	864, 595
Grand total.....	4, 118, 400

¹ For figures on sugarcane acreage in actual production, see exhibit 7b and statement 55, showing 220,000 acres as an average figure in recent years, including both public and private lands.

² For figures on pineapple acreage in actual production, see exhibit 11h, giving the figure 62,677 acres.

³ Estimate. See exhibit 9a, table III, and footnotes thereto, for acreage devoted to diversified agriculture.

EXHIBIT 36D. PRESENTED BY A. LESTER MARKS

Supporting data for sheets 1 and 2

[Area in acres]

SHEET 3

Land under the control of—	Oahu	Maui	Molokai	Lanai	Kahoolawe	Hawaii	Kauai	Niihau	Territory of Hawaii
1. Federal agencies:									
Acres.....	52,403.91	20,005.48	362.26	11.35	23.30	151,899.26	2,164.07		226,869.63
Percent of island.....	13.56	4.29	0.22	0.013	0.08	5.89	0.61		5.51
2. Territorial Land Commissioner:									
2-A. General leases:									
Acres.....	8,491.94	29,310.47	1,368.62		28,800.00	327,151.17	39,025.20		434,147.40
Percent of department.....	52.04	81.75	59.89		100.00	61.37	91.40		65.87
2-B. Sale agreements and permits:									
Acres.....	6,928.00	1,798.61	16.69			1,968.89	469.35		11,181.54
Percent of department.....	42.46	5.02	0.73			0.37	1.10		1.70
2-C. Reserves:									
Acres.....	133.65	567.16	3.11	2.70		132.97	185.75		1,025.34
Percent of department.....	0.82	1.58	0.13	100.00		0.02	0.43		0.16
2-D. Unallotted and waste:									
Acres.....	764.17	4,177.94	896.93			203,842.59	3,019.14		212,700.77
Percent of department.....	4.68	11.65	39.25			38.24	7.07		32.27
Total acres.....	16,317.76	35,854.18	2,285.35	2.70	28,800.00	533,095.62	42,699.44		659,055.05
Percent of island.....	4.22	7.70	1.37	0.003	99.92	20.67	12.02		16.00
3. Executive orders to counties and cities and counties:									
Acres.....	822.22	635.35	31.60			552.22	1,866.05		3,907.44
Percent of island.....	0.21	0.14	0.02			0.02	0.53		0.09
4. Other Territorial department:									
4-A. Executive orders:									
Acres.....	4,593.00	1,210.47	8,470.64	10.50		2,196.83	780.84		17,262.28
Percent of department.....	14.49	1.16	37.32	100.00		0.049	0.98		2.50
4-B. Forest reserves:									
Acres.....	27,097.49	103,541.54	14,229.57			448,841.42	78,925.36		672,635.38
Percent of department.....	85.51	98.84	62.68			99.51	99.02		97.50
Total acres.....	31,690.49	104,752.01	22,700.21	10.50		451,038.25	79,706.20		689,897.66
Percent of island.....	8.20	22.48	13.64	0.01		17.49	22.44		16.75
5. Hawaiian Homes Commission:									
Acres.....	1,135.53	20,108.50	25,940.85			91,149.32	27,978.54		166,312.74
Percent of island.....	0.29	4.32	15.59			3.54	7.88		4.04

6. Counties and cities and counties ownership:									
Acres.....	2,762.13	97.80	19.36	1.03	-----	176.64	51.42	-----	3,108.38
Percent of island.....	0.72	0.02	0.01	0.001	-----	0.007	0.014	-----	0.08
7. Territorial and county roads:									
Acres.....	3,940.00	3,304.00	430.00	100.00	-----	3,701.00	1,421.00	-----	12,896.00
Percent of island.....	1.02	0.71	0.26	0.11	-----	0.14	0.40	-----	0.31
8. Private ownership:									
Acres.....	277,488.04	281,162.88	114,630.37	90,114.42	-----	1,347,587.69	199,313.28	46,080.00	2,356,376.48
Percent of island.....	71.78	60.34	68.89	99.863	-----	52.243	56.106	100.00	57.22
Total area under the control of the Territory of Hawaii.....									
Acres.....	48,008.25	140,606.19	24,985.50	13.20	28,800.00	984,133.87	122,405.64	-----	-----
Percent of island.....	12.42	30.18	15.01	0.015	99.92	38.16	34.46	-----	-----
Total area of island.....	386,860.08	465,920.00	166,400.00	90,240.00	28,623.30	2,579,200.00	355,200.00	46,080.00	4,118,423.38

From taxation maps bureau records of Dec. 31, 1945.

EXHIBIT 37. PRESENTED BY C. NILS TAVARES

REPORT OF THE LAND LAWS REVISION COMMISSION, FEBRUARY 1945

HON. INGRAM M. STAINBACK,
Governor of Hawaii, Honolulu, T. H.

SIR: The undersigned members of the Land Laws Revision Commission appointed on February 21, 1944, make this report pursuant to Joint Resolution 10 of the twenty-second legislature, 1943 session.

Immediately upon organization, written comment, criticism and suggested changes of the existing laws pertaining to the public lands were solicited by the commission by advertisements in the Honolulu daily newspapers in which the public was advised that after the commission had made a preliminary survey of the problems involved they would hold public meetings in each of the counties as contemplated by Joint Resolution 10.

The cooperation of the hold-over senators and the candidates for election to the senate and house of the twenty-third legislature, 1945 regular session, was invited. Their attention was called to the duties imposed upon the Commission by Joint Resolution 10 and they were requested to advise the commission of the names of any individual who had complained about the operation of the public land laws and to give the substance of the complaint.

The commission held the following meetings, after duly published notice thereof, viz:

In Hawaii County:

At Waiakea-waena, October 27, 1944, at 2 p. m.
 At Waiakea-waena, October 27, 1944, at 7:30 p. m.
 At Kamuela, October 28, 1944, at 1:30 p. m.
 At Kohala, October 28, 1944, at 4:30 p. m.
 At Waiohinu, October 30, 1944, at 11 a. m.
 At Hilo, October 31, 1944, at 8:30 a. m.

In Maui County:

At Wailuku, October 31, 1944, at 2 p. m.

In Kauai County:

At Lihue, November 10, 1944, at 2 p. m.
 At Lihue, November 11, 1944, at 9 a. m.

In the city and county of Honolulu:

At Honolulu, December 13, 1944, at 4 p. m.
 At Honolulu, December 15, 1944, at 9 a. m.

To the advertised solicitation for written comment criticism and suggested changes of the existing laws pertaining to public lands of the Territory, the commission received but one communication.

The attendance at the advertised meetings of the commission was as follows:

At the afternoon session at Waiakea-waena.....	0
At the evening session at Waiakea-waena, including a newspaper reporter.....	6
At Kamuela.....	3
At Kohala.....	3
At Hilo.....	0
At Wailuku.....	2
At the afternoon session at Lihue.....	0
At the morning session at Lihue.....	1
At the first meeting at Honolulu.....	2
At the second meeting at Honolulu.....	4

Representatives Andrews, Payne and Nobriga of East Hawaii and Senator Silva of Kohala assisted the commission materially.

The affidavits of publication of notices and hearings the exhibits received and all communications suggesting changes in the public-land laws are reported herewith.

The problem involved is one of the first order which vitally affects the public interest. Within the limits of the allotted time the commission has made a study of the provisions of the Hawaiian Organic Act and of all statute laws relating to the public lands, their present operation and effect. The limitations of time and the magnitude of the task have precluded either a thorough or a complete study.

The commission took the position that as an administrative and fact-finding agency of the Territory it was bound by the opinions of the Attorney General in regard to the matter of the construction and interpretation of the land laws.

The homesteading of public lands in Hawaii has existed since 1895, a period of practically 50 years. Amendments passed in the interim have been consistent with the policy originally laid down. What criticism we have received has been directed not to the policy of the laws but to their administration. It may be that a reexamination of that policy is now in order.

As of June 30, 1942, of the unencumbered agricultural lands of the Territory there were but approximately 1,458 acres; of pastoral land, 9,837 acres.¹ The decrease in the unencumbered lands of the Territory suitable for homesteading brings homesteading into direct competition with the agricultural and pastoral economies of the Territory.

To make available agricultural and pastoral lands for homestead entry the commissioner of public lands under the mandatory provisions of section 73 (m) (n) of the organic act is obliged to exercise the right of withdrawal reposed in him by section 73 (d) of the organic act. The exercise of this right would invade existing revenue-producing leases and poses a serious problem whether the balanced agricultural and pastoral economies of the Territory should be disturbed and large areas of agricultural and pastoral lands now under lease should be opened up for homesteading. The land situation in Hawaii is unique and the past experience on continental United States is of little value in the solution of Hawaii's problem. It is the considered opinion of the Commission that further study of the situation is necessary and in the meantime the mandatory provisions of section 73 (m) (n) of the organic act should be suspended.

The commission of public lands has put the majority of public agricultural and pastoral lands on a revenue-producing basis which policy is not to be condemned but, on the contrary, commended. The chief question is whether existing revenue-producing leases should hereafter be sacrificed to homesteading and to what extent.

A special study was made of the Lualualei homesteads in the city and county of Honolulu, the Kapaa and Wailua on Kauai, the Kula on Maui, the Hawaiian rehabilitation area on Molokai and Waiakea on Hawaii. The last-named project is typical of the problem involved and reflects the result of withdrawing agricultural lands for homesteading purposes.

An analysis of the history of the Waiakea homesteading project is as follows:

The records in the office of the land commissioner show that 216 lots in the Waiakea homestead tract in the South Hilo district, Hawaii, were granted pursuant to existing law to individuals under special homestead agreements in March 1919 and in February 1921 on a total appraised valuation of \$553,773.30. These lots covered an area of 7261.35 acres, of which approximately 6,300 acres were cane land while the balance was made up of other agricultural land, forest, pasture, and waste. All of the land had previously been held by Waiaka Mill Co., Ltd., for the primary purpose of growing sugarcane under a lease from the Territory which expired on June 1, 1918.

As of September 1944 a total of 98 lots had been patented either by the original grantees or their successors in interest. This group represented a total area of 2,937.75 acres and a total purchase price of \$232,644. As of the same date 42 lots are still held by the original grantees or their successors under uncompleted special purchase agreements. The area involved in this second category is 1,381.36 acres and the total purchase price \$111,592.30. Both groups together comprise nearly 60 percent by area of the entire homestead tract, although it should be mentioned here that the ratio would have been considerably less had it not been for action of the legislature in providing relief for the Waiakea homesteaders.²

At the same time it was found that agreements covering 76 lots had been canceled by the Territory on account of nonpayment of installments when due or for breach of covenant or for both reasons. These lots involved a total area of 2,942.14 acres and a total valuation of \$209,877, or approximately 40 percent of the entire tract. Cancellations took place between the years 1930 and 1942.

¹ See report of the Commissioner of Public Lands, etc., for the 2 years ending June 30, 1942, p. 5, and report of Donald S. Carrothers, land map system administrator of the taxation maps bureau of the Territory attached hereto.

² See Act 275, S. L. 1927; J. R. No. 11, 1935 session and O. R. No. 22, 1939 session.

The disposition of the area covered by these canceled agreements is significant. Fifty-four lots, comprising 1,896 acres (approximately 65 percent of the forfeited area) are now held by Waiakea Mill Co., Ltd., for growing sugarcane under general leases from the Territory reserving an aggregate minimum net rental of \$8,033 per annum with an alternative rental providing for an increase of 20 percent per acre per annum for each \$1 increase in the raw sugar price per ton above the minimum of \$50 per ton, New York basis. The average annual rental received by the Territory for the past 3 years on this alternative basis has amounted to approximately \$12,700.

Sixteen lots having a total area of 590.52 acres and a total appraised value of \$39,598.40, were issued to other individuals under new special homestead agreements. Of the latter nine homesteaders have completed their contracts while seven are still held by the new homesteaders or their successors. The six lots remaining, having an area of 396.50 acres and an original valuation of \$16,244, have been leased to various individuals for grazing purposes at a total annual net rental of \$285.

It is interesting also to note the use being made of the lots held under existing or completed homestead agreements. An approximate area of 3,641 acres is used for growing sugarcane. Of this area 3,187 acres have been demised under the so-called 1923 30-year agreement to Waiakea Mill Co., Ltd., under which the homesteader receives a rental equivalent to 5 percent of the gross value of the sugar produced on the land but in no case less than a minimum of \$5 net per acre per annum. The balance of 454 acres is covered by straight cane-purchase agreements between the homesteader and the mill company based on the price of sugar. The income to the homesteader under present conditions probably averages between \$12 and \$15 per acre annually. The bulk of the remaining land in this classification (1,750 acres) comprises forest, waste, and pasture land. Many lots have been subdivided for home sites and small farms. A considerable area consists of original house lots.

The following conclusions are drawn based on the record:

1. The Waiakea house lots have made a desirable residential addition to the city of Hilo and from this standpoint the subdivision may be considered a success.

2. Transfers of title in the 60 percent group comprising patented lots and lots still held in good standing show both gains and losses on the original investment.

3. The project was a complete failure from the standpoint of the 76 original homesteaders or their successors in interest—40 percent of the tract—who forfeited not only their payments to the Territory but also their investment in improvements.

4. Waiakea Mill Co., Ltd., had 6,300 acres in cane within the homestead area in 1918. It now holds 5,340 of these same acres in the form of homestead lots, having regained possession through leases of forfeited lots from the Territory and by means of direct leases or cane-purchase agreements with the homesteaders. An additional 197-acre piece leased by the Territory directly and not by the roundabout process gives the mill company a total cane area in Waiakea of 5,537 acres or more than 87 percent of its cane-land holding under the original lease.

5. Had the Territory been in a position to negotiate a new lease with Waiakea Mill Co. covering the 6,300 acres of cane land instead of subdividing it into homesteads as required by law, it is safe to say that the new annual rental payable to the Territory would have amounted to at least \$50,000 net.

The time available has not permitted sufficient study for the Commission to report upon the probable effect of the withdrawal of pastoral lands for homestead entry.

Homesteading as originally contemplated and continued by the Hawaiian Organic Act and the amendments thereto follows the familiar American pattern under which vast areas of the public domain were transferred to private ownership. In the pioneer days of the last century land on the continent was plentiful and values were low. Governmental policy during this period appears to have been dictated by an urge to settle and develop the West. The homesteader was a rugged individual. He had practically no capital. With the help of his wife and children, a work animal or two, and simple farm tools and equipment he gained a precarious living from the soil. There were no mechanical cultivators, no caterpillar tractors, and no efficient large-scale farming organizations near at hand to work his land for him. He was a farmer by necessity. He succeeded in the face of many adversities by reason of his experience, skill, and toil.

In these islands, even before annexation, the public lands were widely used and yielded substantial revenue to the public treasury. Taro and rice were cultivated in the valleys or on the lowlands where water was readily available for irrigation. The dry uplands were used for grazing purposes. Then came sugar and pineapples, the basis of our present economy, to occupy the arable lands. Water resources were developed for cane irrigation and domestic use. Forests were protected and developed to safeguard the water supply. Hawaii had no frontier of idle land at the time of annexation.

Today the lands of the Territory, both public and private, are used under an industrialized system of agriculture dependent for its success on large-scale operations. Homesteading has been and continues to be in competition with large-scale farming with the result that public lands available to the latter have been withdrawn for subdivision or the homesteader has been shunted off into non-competitive areas where he has been foredoomed to failure. We believe those who continue to advocate homesteading of the public lands in Hawaii are imbued with its possible social and political advantages and do not appraise the facts in the light of experience. Even the political and social results of transferring public lands to individuals who do not work the soil but become landlords to corporate agricultural operators would seem to be of doubtful public interest.

Taking the Waiakea homestead tract, for example, under a 30-year lease issued in the days of the monarchy 6,300 acres of land had been brought under sugarcane cultivation by the tenant, Waiakea Mill Co. Upon termination of the lease the cane land was subdivided and conveyed by lot to 216 individuals under special homestead agreements. Forty percent of these homesteaders forfeited their land through failure to make their payments when due or for other breach of covenant. Sixty percent, either directly or through their successors in interest, were strong enough, many as a result of legislative relief measures, to hold their lots and secure patents. But forfeited or not, we find today nearly 90 percent of the original cane land again in the hands of Waiakea Mill Co. (5,537 acres) for the production of sugar, partly as a result of direct leases with the Territory of forfeited lots and partly by direct lease agreements with the owners of the patented lots or lots still held for patent. The Territory today receives an annual rent of approximately \$12,700 net per annum from Waiakea Mill Co. in this area. It might have received a rental of at least \$50,000 annually if the cane land had been kept intact and leased as a whole to the mill company. Had this been done the people of the Territory generally, and not the 154 homesteaders at Waiakea who retained their lots, would have been the beneficiaries of this increased revenue.

The majority of the Waiakea homesteaders, unlike its pioneer American prototype, had no intention of tilling the soil. The recollection still lingers in many minds of Waiakea No. 1. His intentions may have been of the best but his agricultural background and qualifications were woefully lacking. There were many others in this category. But whatever qualifications the applicants may have had, the results speak for themselves. Almost 90 percent of the original cane area is again under cultivation by the mill company in accordance with large-scale farming methods. The homesteader has retreated to the position of landlord. His tenant is the plantation that cleared and developed the land originally. It would seem that the public interest in the public domain should be conserved and protected against dissipation in favor of the few who may be successful in securing homesteads.

The experience at Waiakea has emphasized the desirability of subdividing public lands into small home sites. Waiakea house lots have been a desirable addition to the residential section of the city of Hilo. There is a vital need for homesites today on the island of Oahu, where workers at Pearl Harbor and elsewhere may build their homes, raise their families, and have enough land in addition on which to raise vegetables, poultry, and other subsistence products for the home.

Whatever conclusions are to be reached as to the desirability of continuing homesteading as presently administered, it is clear that the disposition of public lands as homesites has been successful and beneficial to the public generally in the past. The Commission feels that this activity should not only be continued but should be greatly expanded. The amount of land in the Territory suitable for home sites is very limited. Most of the large landowners are unwilling to part with the fee simple title to lands preferring to lease them under long term leases and retain for themselves the unearned increment to the land and revenue in the form of rent.

At present there is no substantial area of available land for home sites for low-cost or medium-cost homes within easy reach of Pearl Harbor. This district is the natural line of expansion of the city of Honolulu. There are no public lands in this area which could be opened on a large scale for subdivision into home sites. People who work in this vicinity should have the opportunity of owning a home within reasonable distance from their work. The Commission is of the opinion that the Territory should acquire substantial areas of land in the vicinity of Pearl Harbor which, when obtained, can be opened up and offered for sale as home sites. How this could be accomplished, i. e. whether by purchase or condemnation is a matter on which the Commission expresses no opinion. Such a project could be a well-planned addition to the city of Honolulu with roads, utilities, and other improvements constructed under the supervision of the Territory. The total cost of the project should be borne by Territorial funds and the lots when sold priced at a figure sufficient to repay the cost of the project, the land, and betterments.

In view of the fact that such a project not only means the acquisition of land but the planning and construction of improvements, the Commission believes that if such a project is adopted this function should be deposited in a municipal corporation which would be created as a home-site authority to handle all of the details of the project rather than to burden the commissioner of public lands with this function.

Under the circumstances the Commission makes the following recommendations:

1. That a further study be made by it of the provisions of the Hawaiian Organic Act and of all statute laws covering the public lands of the Territory, their present operation and effect;

2. That the tenure of office of the Commission be continued until the close of the 1947 regular session of the legislature;

3. That the Commission report to the Governor on or before January 1, 1947, its further recommendations of such changes in the provisions of the Hawaiian Organic Act and of all statute laws governing the public lands of the Territory as in its opinion are necessary in order to promote the best possible use and disposition of such lands in view of presently existing conditions;

4. That the legislature memorialize the Congress of the United States to suspend for the period of 2 years the mandatory provisions of section 73 (m) (n) of the organic act in respect to the annual survey and opening for homestead entry of agricultural and pastoral lands.

5. The enactment of appropriate legislation creating a municipal corporation for the acquisition of lands for home sites, the construction of improvements, and the subdivision and sale of lots to residents of the Territory.

Respectfully submitted.

E. C. PETERS, *Chairman and Member.*

GEO. M. COLLINS.

J. GARNER ANTHONY.

Dated: February 21, 1945.

EXHIBIT 42. PRESENTED BY GILBERT G. LENTZ

DIVISION OF HONOLULU CITY-COUNTY AND
TERRITORIAL GOVERNMENTAL FUNCTIONS

CITY AND COUNTY OF HAWAII

TERRITORY OF HAWAII

A. GOVERNMENTAL FUNCTIONS

I. GENERAL GOVERNMENT—CONTROL

Legislative

Board of supervisors
Supervisors' committees
Clerk, clerical assistance to the board
Ordinances and proceedings

Legislature
Legislative committee
Clerk and clerical assistance to legislature
Laws and proceedings

CITY AND COUNTY OF HAWAII

TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Executive

Mayor

Governor

*Judicial*Circuit court (sec. 3940, R. L. 1935,
as amended)Supreme court
Land courtDistrict courts (sec. 3941, R. L. 1935,
as amended)Domestic relations division, circuit
court, medical and social service
(sec. 3940, R. L. 1935, as amended)

Sheriff, court bailiffs and civil process

I-A. GENERAL GOVERNMENT—STAFF AGENCIES

Clerk

Secretary of Territory

Finance

Controller

Budget officer

Auditor

Auditor

Treasurer (collects license and vehicle
taxes)Treasurer (collects license, inheritance
insurance taxes)Purchasing agent (purchases and sup-
plies)Division of supplies (budget office)
Tax commissioner, tax collector (Terri-
torial and county)*Law*

Attorney

Attorney general

Prosecutor

Law libraries, supreme court, attorney
general's office

Municipal library

Recording and reporting

Clerk

Secretary of Territory

*Administrative offices and boards*Bureau of plans, department of public
worksRoad planning by superintendent of
public works*Planning and zoning*

City planning commission

Territorial planning board (nonoperat-
ing)

Governor's Committee

Legislative Committee

Personnel administration

(Personnel selection, classification, and administration)

Civil service commission and classifica-
tion boardCivil service commission and classifica-
tion board*(Pension administration)*Pension trustees, police, firemen, and
bandsmen

Retirement system

Retirement board

Research and investigation

Municipal reference library

Territorial planning board (nonoperat-
ing)

Legislative reference bureau

CITY AND COUNTY OF HAWAII

TERRITORY OF HAWAII

General government buildings

Building department	Superintendent of public works. All
City hall and other public buildings, construction and maintenance	Territorial buildings except school buildings
Rural courthouses and police stations	

Community promotion

Mayor. (par. 32, sec. 3021, R. L. 1935, as amended), entertainment of distinguished visitors	Governor, entertainment of distinguished visitors
	Hawaii tourist bureau (nonoperating)
	Equal rights commission

II. PUBLIC SAFETY

Police department (sec. 3022-B, R. L. 1935, as amended)	Crime statistics and identification
Medical care, injured policemen (health department)	Armories and guard
Fire department	
Medical care, injured firemen (health department)	
Medical care, etc., for injured junior police.	
Fire and police alarm and communication system (department of public works)	
Traffic-control signs and markings (department of public works, from public utility franchise fees, sec. 2316, R. L. 1935, as amended)	
Traffic-control signals (department of public works, from public utility franchise fees, sec. 2316, R. L. 1935, as amended)	
Street name signs (department of public works, sec. 2357, R. L. 1935)	
Traffic safety commission (from public utility franchise fees, sec. 2316, R. L. 1935, as amended)	

Protective inspection

Building department
Sheriff, weights and measures

Other protection

Humane society (impounding estrays)
Morgue (health department)
Coroner (sheriff)

Protection to persons—property

Division of fish and game
Regulation of financial institutions
Regulation of insurance companies
Regulation of labor and industrial relations
Radio board
Commissioner of public lands and survey department.
Bureau of conveyances
Regulation of corporations
Regulation of professional occupations
Regulation of boxing
Regulation of explosives

CITY AND COUNTY OF HAWAII

TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Development and conservation of natural resources

Board of agricultural activities (all activities)

III. HIGHWAYS AND AIRPORTS

Street lighting

Maintenance, department of public works
 Electric current (Honolulu)
 Joint pole expense (Honolulu and rural)

Supervision

Chief engineer, department of public works

Roadways

Federal aid highways (Territory of Hawaii maintenance, sec. 1718, R. L. H. 1935)
 Road maintenance, Honolulu district

New construction and reconstruction

Bureau of plans (engineering)
 Kukui and Hall Streets, cutting corner, Siu Hoy Building
 Pauoa Road widening, purchase of land and moving buildings

Roadways

Road maintenance:
 Honolulu district
 Ewa district
 Waianae district
 Waialua district
 Wahiawa district
 Koolauloa district
 Koolaupoko district
 Waimanalo-Kailua district

New construction and reconstruction

Pearl Harbor Road, Fort and Queen Streets, to Oahu Prison (payment to Territorial highway department, Act 62, S. S. L. 1941)	Construction and maintenance of home- stead and special roads as ordered by legislature
Bureau of plans (engineering)	Construction and maintenance of air- ports
Kunawai Lane (purchase of property and moving buildings)	
Prospect Street widening	
Alewa Drive improvement	
Dole Street extension (Act 187, S. L. 1941)	
Kailua Junction, curb and walk	
Kuakini Street widening, land purchase	
King and Liliha corner (construction)	
Waipahu Depot Road	
Fort De Russy roads	
Purchase of miscellaneous rights-of-way	

IV. SANITATION AND WASTE REMOVAL

Sewer systems

Bureau of Sewers, maintenance and extensions
 Storm drainage, new construction and reconstruction

CITY AND COUNTY OF HAWAII

TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Cesspool pumping

Division of refuse collection and disposal

Waste collection and disposal (department of public works)

Collection

Honolulu district
 Ewa district
 Waianae district
 Waialua district
 Wahiawa district
 Koolaupoko district
 Koolauloa district
 Waimanalo-Kailua district

Disposal

Honolulu and rural (incineration and dumping)
 Honolulu (Kapalama ramp construction)

Comfort stations

Construction and maintenance, building department

Sanitation and waste removal

Sewer systems

Highway storm-drain repair (department of public works)
 Laimi Road, drain and wall

Street sanitation

Street sweeping (department of public works)

Sanitation and waste removal, sewer systems

New construction and reconstruction Bureau of sanitation in board of health
 Kuliouou Highway storm drain
 Judd Street storm drain, Judd Street to Nu Place

V. CONSERVATION OF HEALTH

Supervision

City and county physician, administration Administration of commissioner and board of health
 Dentist Vital statistics registration
 Inspectors

Regulation and inspection

Food inspection Bureau of pure food and drugs
 Elevator inspection
 Plumbing inspection
 Health inspection

Control of communicable diseases

Palama Venereal Clinic (subsidy) Bureau of communicable diseases

CITY AND COUNTY OF HAWAII

TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Laboratories

City and county laboratory (health department)

Health centers and general clinics

Palama Medical Clinic (subsidy)	Government physicians
City and county medical clinic (Honolulu)	Division of dental hygiene
City and county medical clinics (rural)	Board of hospitals and settlements, Kalaupapa, etc.
Emergency receiving station and ambulance service (Honolulu)	Plague campaign
City and county dentist	Public Health nursing
Palama Dental Clinic (subsidy)	Crippled children
	Maternal and child health
	Health education
	Bureau of mental hygiene
	Board of examiners, physicians, etc.

VI. HOSPITALS

General municipal hospitals

Maluhia Convalescent Home

Patients in other hospitals

Leahi Hospital (tuberculosis) (sec. 3022, R. L. 1935, as amended)	Contributions to Leahi Home and other tuberculosis hospitals on outlying islands
Psychiatric hospitalization expense (sec. 1238, R. L. 1935, as amended)	Territorial Hospital, insane
General hospitalization expense	Waimano Home, feeble-minded
	Contribution to Shingle Memorial Hospital
	Contribution to Kapiolani Maternity Home

VII. CHARITIES

Dependent and neglected children (domestic relations court)	Department of public welfare (details omitted)
	Aid to blind
	Veterans' aid
	Contribution to Lunalilo Home

VIII. CORRECTIONS

Honolulu Jail	Oahu Prison
Adult probation	Waimano Home (girls)
Juvenile probation and truancy (domestic relations court)	Foster homes
Juvenile shelter home	Waialea (boys)
	Prison inspection

IX. EDUCATION

Building repairs and maintenance	Department of public instruction administration
Furniture and equipment	Public school teachers' salaries
Toilets and other sanitary facilities	Public school supplies and equipment
New buildings, additions and improvements	Books for indigent children
Land: New sites, additions and rents	Vocational schools, personnel and equipment
Land grading and improvements	Future farmers and expansion of agricultural and farm machinery
Janitorial services and supplies	Vocational rehabilitation: Deaf, blind, and disabled
	Public libraries: All islands
	University of Hawaii
	University of Hawaii scholarships

CITY AND COUNTY OF HAWAII

TERRITORY OF HAWAII

X. RECREATION

Royal Hawaiian Band	Fair commission: Territorial golf links
Recreation commission	Kamehameha Day celebration
Park board (sec. 3232, R. L. 1935, as amended) (see also road fund)	Hulihee Palace
	Father Damien Memorial
	War memorial

XI. MISCELLANEOUS

Pensions

Legislative pensions (Act 248, S. L. 1929, as amended)	Legislative pensions
Retirement system contribution (sec. 7927, R. L. 1935, as amended)	Retirement contributions
Retirement system contributions for employee in armed forces (Act 72, S. S. L. 1941)	
Medical care and hospitalization of pensioners: Health department (Act 90, S. L. 1937)	

Cemeteries and crematories

Burial of indigent dead

Unclassified

Residential rent control commission	Commercial rent control
Liquor control commission	Director, liquor control
	Director, land transportation

XII. DEBT SERVICE

Interest

Territory of Hawaii bonds (sec. 1922, R. L. 1935, as amended)	Interest on Territory of Hawaii bonds
City and county bonds (sec. 1922, R. L. 1935, as amended)	Sinking fund contributions and redemption of serial bonds
Territory of Hawaii bonds (sec. 1922, R. L. 1935, as amended)	
City and county bonds (sec. 1922, R. L. 1935, as amended)	

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICE ENTERPRISES

Board of water supply

XIV. LABOR

Workmen's compensation contributions	Labor and industrial relations
	Workmen's compensation administration
	Research and statistics
	Labor law enforcement

EXHIBIT 43. PRESENTED BY CAMPBELL C. CROZIER

Real property inventory schedule showing private ownerships, Jan. 1, 1945

SCHEDULE I. CITY AND COUNTY OF HONOLULU—AREA 386,560 ACRES

	Totals				Commercial		Hotel and apart- ments		Residential		Agricultural		Miscellaneous	
	Acres	Per- cent	Value ¹	Per- cent	Acres	Value ¹	Acres	Value ¹	Acres	Value ¹	Acres	Value ¹	Acres	Value ¹
1. B. P. Bishop estate ²	57,706.97	14.93	\$17,511,464	4.29	165.63	4,416,799	25.46	\$2,582,592	2,024.68	\$5,980,518	18,313.90	\$2,147,088	37,177.30	\$2,384,467
2. Jas. Campbell estate.....	51,212.56	13.25	6,052,177	1.48	56.08	1,181,988			571.93	611,709	40,217.52	4,135,304	10,367.03	123,176
3. Waialua Ag. Co.....	28,737.01	7.43	2,798,591	.69	1.88	7,543			119.36	30,342	23,118.68	2,755,209	5,497.09	5,497
4. John I. Estate, Ltd.....	17,027.77	4.40	2,050,597	.50	12.50	74,573			288.91	97,675	9,676.10	1,841,641	7,050.26	36,708
5. H. K. L. Castle.....	13,977.39	3.62	1,211,030	.30	6.28	50,665			383.97	631,397	6,841.88	464,890	6,745.26	64,078
6. L. L. McCandless estate.....	6,255.44	1.62	452,926	.11	3.25	234,343			380.24	108,073	3,524.48	97,537	2,347.47	12,973
7. Waianae Co.....	7,123.76	1.84	296,037	.07	3.69	8,845			154.53	74,655	4,483.35	198,394	2,482.19	14,143
8. Zions Sec. Corp.....	6,385.27	1.65	268,296	.07	.57	749			105.27	125,530	3,381.84	119,618	2,897.59	22,399
9. S. M. Damon estate.....	5,302.05	1.37	1,209,718	.30	4.50	82,843			415.85	700,098	4,868.28	346,426	13.42	80,351
10. M. P. Robinson estate.....	5,405.10	1.40	1,156,430	.28	5.09	197,682	.90	47,007	5.30	12,076	4,338.29	898,618	1,055.52	1,047
11. Mary E. Foster estate.....	4,627.08	1.20	98,318	.02	.08	13,225			23.72	31,935	4,525.06	52,131	78.22	1,027
12. Kualoa Ranch, Ltd.....	4,001.25	1.04	292,235	.07					192.07	192,270		839.41	72,154	2,969.77
13. J. N. Austin estate.....	2,903.60	.75	694,763	.17	1.41	611,421					655.94	74,563	2,246.25	8,779
14. J. P. Mendonca trust estate.....	2,773.59	.72	527,961	.13	1.33	203,444			209.68	84,220	2,483.13	240,065	79.45	232
15. Geo. Galbraith trust estate.....	2,248.08	.58	466,222	.11							2,000.49	465,969	247.59	253
16. Kahaluu land trust.....	2,394.91	.62	95,922	.02	1.65	4,295			137.70	25,116	928.19	58,547	1,327.31	7,964
17. Robert Hind, Ltd.....	2,117.30	.55	194,440	.05					8.54	18,882	306.50	129,901	1,802.26	45,657
18. Hawaiian Aracado Co.....	2,115.70	.55	74,190	.02	3.88	2,726			7.95	1,476	2,095.87	69,980	8.00	8
19. Oahu R. & L. Co.....	1,735.18	.45	4,752,584	1.17	502.89	4,568,374			103.09	118,577	1,015.74	53,129	113.46	12,507
20. Mokuieia R. & L. Co.....	2,359.80	.61	160,002	.04					197.85	102,320	2,141.65	57,553	20.30	129
21. Emma Kaleleonalani.....	2,716.38	.70	989,370	.24	3.80	496,119	18.99	332,421	1.72	2,066	1,137.55	92,219	1,554.32	66,545
22. Roman Catholic Church.....	1,467.07	.38	976,957	.24	4.20	207,496			6.02	13,387	1,259.73	50,453	197.12	705,621
23. Sing Chong Co.....	1,424.32	.37	66,019	.02					15.32	11,631	900.43	51,337	508.57	3,051
24. Hawaiian Pineapple Co.....	991.35	.26	3,542,523	.87	60.69	3,435,166			48.19	96,326	877.12	10,964	5.35	67
25. Charlotte H. L. Cassidy et al.....	921.15	.24	156,946	.04					25.43	73,409	595.72	74,537	300.00	9,000
26. Hawaiian Land and Improvement Co.....	699.00	.18	172,094	.05	2.67	60,141	1.63	5,238	.34	1,213	663.55	101,736	30.81	3,766

¹ Value includes improvements.² See exhibit 68 relating to the Bishop estate.

Honolulu, T. H., Nov. 8, 1945. G. R. Leonard.

Real property inventory schedule showing private ownerships, Jan. 1, 1945—Continued

	Totals				Commercial		Hotel and apart- ments		Residential		Agricultural		Miscellaneous	
	Acres	Per- cent	Value ¹	Per- cent	Acres	Value ¹	Acres	Value ¹	Acres	Value ¹	Acres	Value ¹	Acres	Value ¹
27. Chas. W. Lucas Trust.....	791.71	0 20	\$58,286	0 01	-----	-----	-----	-----	4.36	\$3,550	524.35	\$45,002	263.00	\$4,734
28. Wahiawa Water Co.....	519.66	. 13	145,430	. 04	2.41	\$39,488	-----	-----	63.40	65,927	429.32	38,307	24.53	1,708
S/T 28 owners.....	235,940.00	(61.04)	46,471,531	(11.40)	844.00	15,897,925	47.00	\$2,967,258	5,495.00	9,219,378	142,144.00	14,743,272	87,410.00	3,643,698
All other taxpayers.....	47,671.00	12.33	158,184,140	38.79	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Total taxpayers.....	283,611.00	(73.37)	204,655,671	(50.19)	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Government exempt:														
Federal.....	51,890.00	13.42	164,276,284	40.29	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Territorial.....	50,324.00	13.02	31,448,126	7.71	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
County.....	735.00	. 19	7,375,405	1.81	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
S/T Governments.....	102,949.00	(26.63)	203,099,815	(49.81)	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Grand total.....	386,560.00	100.00	407,755,486	100.00	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

¹ Value includes improvements.

SCHEDULE II—ISLAND OF MAUI, AREA, 465,920 ACRES

	Areas in acres	Relative percentage of areas	Areas within forest reserve	Assessed value ¹	Relative percentage of assessed value
East Maui Irrigation Co., Ltd.	18,739.550	4.02	(14,215.50)	\$39,884	0.152
Maui Agricultural Co., Ltd.	24,398.790	5.24	(1,231.90)	2,582,659	9.870
Hawaiian Commercial & Sugar Co., Ltd.	32,637.720	7.00		4,329,741	16.340
Baldwin Packers	23,283.450	5.00	(8,320.00)	859,402	3.284
Haleakala ranch	30,070.540	6.45	(1,600.00)	215,737	.824
Ulupalakua ranch	28,439.190	6.10	(3,972.20)	160,575	.613
Kaupo ranch	9,989.240	2.14		31,085	.118
Maui Pineapple Co.	6,646.310	1.43		863,643	3.300
Austin estate	3,186.750	.68		9,816	.040
Campbell estate	8,960.527	1.92		17,165	.065
Bishop estate	2,546.100	.55		121,620	.465
Kaeleku Sugar Co. (Fagan)	5,932.310	1.27	(859.00)	258,177	.987
Commissioner of public lands	36,294.880	7.79			
Other Territorial departments	104,483.630	22.43	(103,341.54)	3,234,440	12.361
Hawaiian Homes Commission	20,175.500	4.33	(1,600.00)		
Federal agencies (Army, Navy, etc.)	17,347.470	3.72		1,014,414	3.877
County of Maui	735.080	.15		936,485	3.579
All others	92,052.963	19.77		11,491,812	43.918
Total	465,920.000	100.00		26,166,655	100.000

¹ Value includes improvements.

SCHEDULE III—ISLAND OF MOLOKAI, AREA 166,400 ACRES

Molokai ranch	69,695.410	41.88	(4,607.00)	\$1,631,741	48.78
Puuohaku ranch (Fagan)	13,867.820	8.33		113,925	3.40
R. W. Meyer, Ltd.	2,984.370	1.79	(1,706.36)	39,105	1.17
Commissioner of public lands	1,892.030	1.14			
Hawaiian Homes Commission	25,892.100	15.56		644,716	19.27
Other Territorial departments	22,621.490	13.59	(14,138.58)		
Federal agencies (Army, Navy, etc.)	362.260	.22		3,056	.09
Bishop estate	4,717.240	2.83		17,368	.05
County of Kalawao	8,248.000	4.95		96,000	2.87
All others	16,119.280	9.70		799,341	23.90
Total	166,400.000	100.00		3,345,252	100.00

SCHEDULE IV—ISLAND OF LANAI, AREA 90,240 ACRES

Commissioner of public lands	2.700			\$3	.01
Other Territorial departments	10.500	.01		28,815	1.34
Federal agencies (Army, Navy, etc.)	11.350	.02		367	.02
Hawaiian Pineapple Co., Ltd.	90,215.450	99.97		2,111,893	98.63
Total	90,240.000	100.00		2,141,078	100.00

SCHEDULE V—ISLAND OF KAHOO LAWE, AREA 28,823 ACRES

Commissioner of public lands	28,799.70	99.92		\$3,671	91.34
Federal agencies (Army, Navy, etc.)	23.30	.08		342	8.66
Total	28,823.00	100.00		4,019	100.00

SCHEDULE VI—ISLAND OF HAWAII, AREA 2,579,200 ACRES

Campbell estate	25,999.200	1.01		\$4,844	0.01
Bishop estate	292,750.930	11.35		1,761,939	3.90
Parker ranch	339,472.620	13.16	(3,937.40)	791,495	1.75
Shipman ranch	74,182.940	2.88		603,806	1.34
Kohala Sugar	14,764.620	.57	(2,737.65)	921,011	2.04
Commissioner of public lands	527,120.050	20.44		6,457,855	14.31
Other Territorial departments	456,168.750	17.69	(453,837.77)	1,980,260	4.39
Hawaiian Homes Commission	91,589.87	3.55	(97.50)	622,021	1.38
County of Hawaii	566.930	.02		671,300	1.49
Federal agencies (Army, Navy, etc.)	151,842.810	5.89		814,116	1.80
McCandless estate	29,919.120	1.16		27,917	.06
Greenwell estate	30,532.650	1.18		318,886	.71
All others	544,607.840	21.10		30,147,548	66.82
Total	2,579,200.000	100.00		45,122,998	100.00

SCHEDULE VII—ISLAND OF KAUAI, AREA, 355,200 ACRES

	Areas in acres	Relative percentage of areas	Areas within forest reserve	Assessed value ¹	Relative percentage of assessed value
Bishop estate.....	10,746.800	3.02	-----	\$19,402	0.11
Rice, Ltd.	4,131.290	1.16	-----	83,870	.46
McBryde Sugar Co.	12,210.650	3.44	(2,735.00)	1,170,498	6.40
Lihue Plantation Co., Ltd.	43,582.490	12.27	(16,195.00)	2,985,327	16.34
Grove farm.....	14,517.000	4.09	-----	630,589	3.45
Knudsen estate.....	4,815.660	1.36	-----	196,094	1.07
Koloa Sugar Co.	8,194.560	2.31	-----	396,952	3.27
Gay & Robinson.....	55,446.690	15.61	(3,024.00)	1,854,205	10.15
Kilauea Sugar Co.	7,820.170	2.20	(2,089.71)	271,442	1.47
Commissioner of public lands.....	42,771.20	12.04	-----	-----	-----
Other Territorial departments.....	79,685.920	22.43	(78,815.21)	1,245,820	6.82
Hawaiian Homes Commission.....	27,979.350	7.88	(7,372.00)	-----	-----
County of Kauai.....	1,927.000	.54	-----	715,729	3.92
Federal agencies (Army, Navy, etc.).....	2,164.070	.61	-----	120,719	.66
All others.....	39,207.150	11.04	-----	8,383,576	45.88
Total.....	355,200.000	100.00	-----	18,274,223	100.00

SCHEDULE VIII—ISLAND OF NIIHAU, AREA, 46,080 ACRES

Gay & Robinson.....	46,080.000	100.00	-----	\$87,821	-----
---------------------	------------	--------	-------	----------	-------

EXHIBIT 44. PRESENTED BY CAMPBELL C. CROZIER

Land ownership (by acreage) expressed by percentage as of December 31, 1945

(Prepared by Campbell C. Crozier, assistant tax commissioner)

Government lands.....	42.78
Federal lands.....	5.47
Other public lands.....	37.31
Private lands.....	57.22
Largest owner.....	8.87
10 largest owners (including largest owner) ¹	30.11
50 largest owners (including 10 largest owners).....	39.55
Other owners.....	17.67
Total.....	100.00

¹ 10 largest owners in order of their holdings are: (1) B. P. Bishop estate, (2) Smart estate (Parker Ranch), (3) Gay & Robinson, (4) Hawaiian Pineapple Co., (5) James Campbell estate, (6) W. H. Shipman, Ltd., (7) Molokai Ranch Co., Ltd., (8) Lihue Plantation Co., (9) L. L. McCandless estate, (10) Hawaiian Commercial & Sugar Co.

EXHIBIT 45B. PRESENTED BY JOSEPH DICKSON

Territory of Hawaii—Consolidated balance sheet showing assets, liabilities, reserves, and surplus as of the close of the biennium ended June 30, 1945

	General fund	Special funds	Revolving funds	Trust funds	Loan funds	Sinking funds	Clearance funds	Consolidated total
A. Assets:								
1. Cash	\$3,140,888.83	\$22,304,008.81	\$772,449.12	\$1,366,580.57	\$135,743.45	\$554,616.98	\$7,259,626.75	\$35,533,914.51
2. Cash due from other funds	2,525,175.99	299,513.81		4,399,665.69		336.22		7,224,691.71
3. Cash due from employees' retirement system	16,770.35							16,770.35
4. Temporary loans to other funds	6,760,000.00	1,000,000.00	500,000.00					8,260,000.00
5. Temporary loan to county of Hawaii	450,000.00							450,000.00
6. Taxes receivable, levied for Territorial purposes	2,157,877.36							2,157,877.36
7. Taxes receivable, levied for counties' purposes				4,571,810.42				4,571,810.42
8. Accounts receivable	1,159,518.57	3,000.00	6,768.21					1,166,286.78
9. Notes receivable			389,977.07					389,977.07
10. Due from other funds	25,000.00							25,000.00
11. Investments	8,500,000.00	7,606.10	788,610.88	25,000.00		21,706,300.00		31,027,516.98
12. Deferred debits			25,000.00					25,000.00
Total assets	24,735,231.10	23,614,128.72	2,482,805.28	10,363,056.68	135,743.45	22,261,253.20	7,259,626.75	90,851,845.18
B. Liabilities:								
13. Immediate demands against cash	2,111,241.16	709,667.80	256,390.17	5,738,147.58	1.10		8,507.70	8,823,955.51
14. Cash due to other funds				1,786.75			7,222,904.96	7,224,691.71
15. Temporary loans from other funds						8,260,000.00		8,260,000.00
16. Matured bonds outstanding		14,000.00				10,000.00		24,000.00
17. Due to other funds			25,000.00					25,000.00
18. Other current liabilities			13,310.33	4,196,804.87				4,210,115.20
C. Deferred credits	3,342,395.93	10,606.10	1,172,045.83	25,000.00			28,214.09	4,578,261.95
D. Reserves				375,005.55		8,568,563.61		8,943,569.16
Total liabilities, deferred credits, and reserves	5,453,637.09	734,273.90	1,466,746.33	10,336,744.75	1.10	16,838,563.61	7,259,626.75	42,089,593.53
E. Current surplus¹	19,281,594.01	22,879,854.82	1,016,058.95	26,311.93	135,742.35	5,422,689.59		48,762,251.65
Add: Bonds authorized and unissued					2,724,569.44			2,724,569.44
Total	19,281,594.01	22,879,854.82	1,016,058.95	26,311.93	2,860,311.79	5,422,689.59		51,486,821.09
Deduct:								
Unexpended appropriations	14,233,271.27	22,879,854.82	1,016,058.95	26,311.93	2,860,311.79			41,015,808.76
Estimated obligations	5,319.17							5,319.17
Unappropriated surplus	5,043,003.57					5,422,689.59		10,465,693.16

¹ Reconciliation of current surplus with unappropriated surplus appearing on consolidated budget statement.

NOTE.—Fixed assets are excluded from the balance sheet because they do not represent resources out of which the Territory intends to meet its liabilities or by means of which it is enabled to earn revenues. Fixed assets are acquired for the purpose of rendering service.
Prepared by Territorial auditing department.

Appropriations due to revolving funds: Revolving fund for purchase of surplus property from the Federal Government.....	750,000.00						750,000.00
Appropriations due to employees' retirement system.....	335,304.83						335,304.83
Unliquidated encumbrances.....	569,831.48	97,411.85	2,500.00				669,743.33
Refunds authorized by law.....	2,073.68		22,500.00				24,573.68
Contingent appropriations.....	300,561.39						300,561.39
Total unexpended appropriations.....	14,233,271.27	22,879,854.82	1,016,058.95	26,311.93	2,860,311.79		41,015,808.76
Temporary loans from other funds.....						8,260,000.00	8,260,000.00
Matured bonds outstanding.....		14,000.00				10,000.00	24,000.00
C. Reserves:							
Retirement of public improvement term bonds.....						6,311,193.77	6,311,193.77
Retirement of refunding serial bonds.....						2,257,369.84	2,257,369.84
Estimated obligations.....	5,319.17						5,319.17
Total obligations and reserves.....	14,238,590.44	22,893,854.82	1,016,058.95	26,311.93	2,860,311.79	16,838,563.61	57,873,691.54
E. Unappropriated surplus as at June 30, 1945.....	5,043,003.57					5,422,689.59	10,465,693.16

Prepared by Territorial Auditing Department.

EXHIBIT 45D. PRESENTED BY JOSEPH DICKSON

Consolidated statement of operations, Territory of Hawaii and its political subdivisions, receipts for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945

CHARACTER OF RECEIPTS

	Territory of Hawaii		City and county of Honolulu		County of Maui		County of Hawaii		County of Kauai		Total	
		Per cent		Per cent		Per cent		Per cent		Per cent		Per cent
A. Revenue receipts:												
(a) Taxes:												
1. Property taxes.....			\$6,192,000.00	38.04	\$1,166,818.66	49.05	\$1,329,095.17	45.10	\$900,698.97	57.05	\$9,588,612.80	15.23
2. Income taxes.....	12,048,695.25	30.30									12,048,695.25	19.14
2c. Inheritance and estate taxes.....	225,243.41	.57									225,243.41	.36
2d. Poll taxes.....	35,416.82	.09									35,416.82	.06
4. Business license taxes.....	15,169,953.72	38.15	243,839.56	1.50	130,213.28	5.47	160,216.54	5.44	18,124.15	1.15	15,722,347.25	24.98
5. Nonbusiness license taxes and permits.....	439,125.68	1.10	2,030,757.65	12.48	177,161.31	7.45	217,485.95	7.38	121,799.05	7.71	2,986,329.64	4.74
6. Unemployment compensation taxes.....	1,775,207.14	4.46									1,775,207.14	2.82
6b. All other taxes.....			246,811.56	1.52	9,285.37	.39	25,948.20	.88	130,719.34	8.28	412,764.47	.65
Total taxes.....	29,693,642.02	74.67	8,713,408.77	53.54	1,483,478.62	62.36	1,732,745.86	58.80	1,171,341.51	74.19	42,794,616.78	67.98
(b) Nontaxes:												
7. Special assessments and special charges.....	230,615.57	.58	210,599.54	1.29							441,215.11	.70
7c. Fines, forfeits, and escheats.....	20,892.41	.05	802,950.82	4.93	35,097.04	1.48	78,569.74	2.67	20,321.23	1.29	957,831.24	1.52
8. Grants-in-aid.....	3,787,785.19	9.52	537,800.00	3.31	541,307.41	22.75	524,495.89	17.80	211,762.11	13.41	5,603,150.60	8.90
9. Donations from private sources.....	35,039.59	.09					5,000.00	.17			40,039.59	.06
10. Rent of investment properties.....	945,585.23	2.37	11,790.34	.07	2,432.40	.10	19,282.20	.65			979,090.17	1.56
11. Interest.....	1,288,941.53	3.24	62,780.58	.32	391.11	.02					1,342,113.22	2.13
12. Earnings of general departments:												
I. General government.....	39,607.68	.10	64,225.25	.39	15,407.92	.65	10,234.05	.35	6,713.75	.43	136,188.65	.22
II. Protection.....	672,465.11	1.69	70,739.86	.43	980.50	.04			3,226.75	.20	747,412.22	1.19
III. Highways.....					1,153.63	.05	29,230.25	.99	7,271.72	.46	37,655.50	.06
IV. Development and conservation of natural resources.....	17,966.38	.05									17,966.38	.03
V. Health and sanitation.....	34,612.35	.09	639,021.70	3.93	221.73	.01					673,855.78	1.07
VI. Hospitals and institutions for handicapped.....	195,044.01	.49	117,180.01	.72	152,947.38	6.43	368,667.85	12.51			833,839.25	1.82

VII. Charities	25.00									25.00	
VIII. Correction	86,801.35	.22	3,365.15	.02	60.00					90,226.50	.14
IX. Schools	445,198.21	1.12	3,368.25	.02	4,355.00	.18				452,921.46	.72
X. Libraries	5.50									5.50	
XI. Recreation	50,906.11	.13	33,524.46	.21	4,991.95	.21			9,172.00	98,594.52	.16
XII. Miscellaneous	134,219.22	.34	62,893.72	.39			1,289.14	.04	19,250.75	217,652.83	.35
XIII. Public service enterprises	2,089,759.25	5.25	4,951,896.86	30.43	135,983.84	5.72	177,327.15	6.02	129,773.60	7,484,740.70	11.89
Total nontaxes	10,075,469.69	25.33	7,562,136.54	46.46	895,329.91	37.64	1,214,086.27	41.20	407,491.91	20,154,524.32	32.0
Total revenue receipts	39,769,111.71	100.00	16,275,545.31	100.00	2,378,808.53	100.00	2,946,842.13	100.00	1,578,833.42	62,949,141.10	100.00
B. Nonrevenue receipts:											
76. Borrowings					63,202.36		450,000.00			513,202.36	
77. From other civil divisions	1,545.88									1,545.88	
78. From objects of private trust	73,748.98									73,748.98	
79. From sales of investments	10,698,245.01		378,677.73				1,607.88			11,078,530.62	
80. From decrease of storehouse supplies	1,788,606.74									1,788,606.74	
81. From offsets to outlay payments			37,620.50		50,347.09		68,562.94			156,530.53	
82. From counterbalancing receipts	2,393.54		83,265.69		1,506.12		151,927.18		156,335.98	395,428.51	
Total nonrevenue receipts	12,564,540.15		499,563.92		115,055.57		672,098.00		156,335.98	14,007,593.62	
C. Transfer receipts:											
83. Nonrecoverable transfers from other funds	9,162,641.03				240,792.84		701,480.94		82,598.21	10,187,513.02	
83. Nonrecoverable transfers from employees' retirement system	55,809.00									55,809.00	
84. Borrowings and repayments from other funds	10,114,600.00		50,000.00		585,000.00		473,990.79			11,223,590.79	
Total transfer receipts	19,333,050.03		50,000.00		825,792.84		1,175,471.73		82,598.21	21,466,912.81	
Total receipts	71,666,701.89		16,825,109.23		3,319,656.94		4,794,411.86		1,817,767.61	98,423,647.53	
D. Available cash at beginning of year	27,332,482.51		4,828,248.51		389,731.95		226,062.29		411,257.77	33,187,783.03	
Grand total	98,999,184.40		21,653,357.74		3,709,388.89		5,020,474.15		2,229,025.38	131,611,430.56	

Consolidated statement of operations, Territory of Hawaii and its political subdivisions, receipts for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945—Cont.

OBJECT OF PAYMENT

	Territory of Hawaii		City and county of Honolulu		County of Maui		County of Hawaii		County of Kauai		Total	
		Per-cent		Per-cent		Per-cent		Per-cent		Per-cent		Per-cent
A. Governmental cost payments:												
Division of government:												
I. General government.....	\$2,026,528.68	7.36	\$961,527.10	7.13	\$251,255.26	10.72	\$337,527.16	10.59	\$169,078.01	10.22	\$3,745,916.21	7.77
II. Protection.....	1,474,405.61	5.35	2,260,173.07	16.75	364,773.72	15.57	503,685.19	15.81	333,050.40	20.14	4,936,088.99	10.24
III. Highways.....	2,189,351.55	7.95	1,009,716.62	7.48	295,658.71	12.62	735,520.44	23.09	396,997.52	24.01	4,627,244.84	9.59
IV. Development and conserva- tion of natural resources.....	1,006,727.56	3.66							8,345.10	.50	1,015,072.66	2.10
V. Health and sanitation.....	1,749,682.84	6.35	1,843,331.15	13.66	39,375.36	1.68	43,398.92	1.36	46,790.58	2.83	3,722,578.85	7.72
VI. Hospitals and institutions for handicapped.....	2,803,600.76	10.18	458,389.36	3.40	603,369.06	25.75	858,562.35	26.95	218,268.99	13.20	4,942,190.52	10.25
VII. Charities.....	2,250,414.22	8.17	3,873.03	.03	4,148.56	.18			1,000.47	.06	2,259,436.28	4.69
VIII. Correction.....	773,478.68	2.81	233,835.24	1.73	28,294.01	1.21					1,035,607.93	2.15
IX. Schools.....	10,587,393.07	38.45	803,532.08	5.96	136,671.18	5.83	263,371.09	8.27	93,706.93	5.67	11,884,674.35	24.65
X. Libraries.....	338,693.59	1.23							12.00		338,705.59	.70
XI. Recreation.....	69,525.25	.25	470,819.04	3.49	43,227.94	1.84	111,575.85	3.50	57,617.17	3.48	752,765.25	1.56
XII. Miscellaneous.....	965,358.87	3.14	1,601,715.99	11.87	225,058.63	9.61	162,628.24	5.10	233,967.55	14.15	3,088,729.28	6.42
XIII. Public service enterprises.....	382,512.79	1.39	3,391,478.35	25.13	258,744.77	11.04	137,560.83	4.32	95,005.48	5.74	4,265,302.22	8.84
Total divisions I through XIII.....	26,517,673.47	96.29	13,038,391.03	96.63	2,250,577.20	96.05	3,153,831.07	98.99	1,653,840.20	100.00	46,614,312.97	96.68
XIV. Interest.....	1,021,957.25	3.71	454,198.79	3.37	92,535.75	3.95	32,101.61	1.01			1,600,793.40	3.32
Total governmental cost payments.....	27,539,630.72	100.00	13,492,589.82	100.00	2,343,112.95	100.00	3,185,932.68	100.00	1,653,840.20	100.00	48,215,106.37	100.00
B. Nongovernmental cost payments:												
76. For debt obligations.....	2,740,000.00	-----	569,748.88	-----	168,159.36	-----	77,500.00	-----	91,489.05	-----	3,646,897.29	-----
77. To other civil divisions.....	854,817.28	-----		-----		-----	79,292.17	-----		-----	934,109.45	-----
78. For objects of private trust.....	73,757.92	-----		-----		-----		-----		-----	73,757.92	-----
79. For investments purchased.....	19,698,511.90	-----	91,647.78	-----		-----		-----		-----	19,790,159.68	-----
80. For increase of storehouse sup- plies.....	1,544,790.83	-----		-----		-----	1,798.91	-----	521.23	-----	1,547,110.97	-----
81. Outlay payments offset by re- ceipts.....		-----	42,482.17	-----	50,347.09	-----	2,580.45	-----		-----	95,409.71	-----
82. For counterbalancing payments.....	40,278.44	-----		-----	1,506.12	-----	16,724.93	-----		-----	58,509.49	-----
Total nongovernmental cost payments.....	24,952,156.37	-----	703,878.83	-----	220,012.57	-----	177,896.46	-----	92,010.28	-----	26,145,954.51	-----

C. Transfer payments:									
83. Nonrecoverable transfers to other funds.....	9,162,641.03	-----	-----	240,792.84	-----	701,480.94	-----	82,598.21	10,187,513.02
83. Nonrecoverable transfers to employees' retirement system.....	531,641.02	-----	-----		-----		-----		531,641.02
84. Borrowings and repayments to other funds.....	10,114,600.00	-----	50,000.00	585,000.00	-----	473,990.79	-----		11,223,590.79
Total transfer payments.....	19,808,882.05	-----	50,000.00	825,792.84	-----	1,175,471.73	-----	82,598.21	21,942,744.83
Total payments.....	72,300,669.14	-----	14,246,468.65	3,388,918.36	-----	4,539,300.87	-----	1,828,448.69	96,303,805.71
D. Available cash at close of year.....	26,698,515.26	-----	7,406,889.09	320,470.53	-----	481,173.28	-----	400,576.69	35,307,624.85
Grand total.....	98,999,184.40	-----	21,653,357.74	3,709,388.89	-----	5,020,474.15	-----	2,229,025.38	131,611,430.56

EXHIBIT 47. PRESENTED BY HAL HANNA

INGRAM M. STAINBACK, GOVERNOR OF HAWAII SAYS: "LAND MONOPOLY IN HAWAII"

(Compiled by Representative Hal Hanna, member, 23d sess.,
1945 Territorial Legislature)

This booklet is dedicated to the good people of the Territory of Hawaii.

If this little instrument is in any way responsible for the opening up of * * * fee-simple land in Hawaii, for homesites and business locations, then I will feel that my time and effort will not have been in vain.

HAL HANNA.

LAND

Maury Maverick, the author of *In Blood and Ink*, had the following to say in his book:

"Ownership of the land, or property rights in it, is the basis of all liberties. Land is wealth; wealth is power; power is liberty. In the last analysis, the liberty of the people (or an individual) depends upon the quantity and quality of the land they possess.

Democracy to me is liberty * * * plus economic security."

The people of the Territory of Hawaii own only 8.7 percent. By people, we are referring to the masses.

MESSAGE OF INGRAM M. STAINBACK, GOVERNOR OF HAWAII, TO TWENTY-THIRD
SESSION OF THE TERRITORIAL LEGISLATURE, ON LAND

LANDS FOR HOMES

The great landholding monopolies which exist in this Territory have resulted, especially on Oahu, in an artificial shortage and unhealthy increase in the value of lands available for residences—so extreme as to render impracticable any scheme for adequate housing with private capital unless and until sufficient lands at reasonable prices for new buildings can be made available. In my opinion the present city of Honolulu proper has reached the saturation point so far as available lands for this purpose are concerned, and no substantial relief can be anticipated unless the Territory acts to acquire through the power of eminent domain additional land areas for subdivision and sale for residential purposes.

I therefore recommend the creation of a public corporation or agency authorized to acquire private lands by purchase or condemnation on the island of Oahu, to borrow funds for that purpose, and to subdivide, improve, and sell such lands for residential purposes, with adequate planning for schools, parks, playgrounds, business areas, etc., to serve such new subdivisions. Details of this proposed project, as well as of proposed emergency housing, will be submitted to you later with a suggested draft of proposed legislation to accomplish the desired results.

FEBRUARY 22, 1945,

FOREWORD

There now exists in this Territory a condition in the ownership of land which is inimical to the public welfare and interest; that the problem lies in the ownership of a considerable portion of the land in the Territory by corporations, trusts, and other organizations created or conducted for charitable or religious purposes, which have a perpetual or a continued existence for a long term of years; that such organizations have in many instances adopted and adhered to a policy of not alienating their holdings; that such practice is not required by the demands of prudent investment; that such policy has led to the locking up of a considerable portion of the land in the Territory in the hands of a relatively few such organizations; that such restraints on the free transmission of land and the consequent withdrawal of such holdings from free commerce have given rise to a serious problem in view of the limited resources of land in the Territory; that the problem has been greatly aggravated by the large increase in recent years in the population of the Territory, which increase has resulted in a public emergency in housing; that one of the primary factors contributing to such emergency has been the concentration and retention of land in the hands of such organizations; that such circumstances have also materially impeded

the normal expansion of business and trade in the Territory; that for such and similar reasons the continuance of such large holdings by such organizations is deemed to constitute a public evil and a menace to the health and welfare of the inhabitants of the Territory and is contrary to public policy; that free alienation of land and ownership of land by a substantial portion of the public are basic features of a democratic society, and the promotion thereof a matter of public concern and interest.

[Letter to the editor, Honolulu Star-Bulletin]

INSISTENT DEMAND FOR HOME SITES

EDITOR, THE STAR-BULLETIN: Our Governor in the past has received several uncomplimentary remarks by a certain editor of a certain newspaper.

I have never had the privilege of meeting our Governor, but he seems to be a good fellow.

I believe that when he introduced in the house through a representative a bill creating a home developing authority, he certainly hit the right idea, and deserves a good hand.

To those of you living in crowded and congested Honolulu, my deepest sympathy goes to you.

But listen, we who live in the country and who are surrounded by sugarcane and pineapple fields are also getting a lot of headaches. The Navy Department is purchasing a lot of land in the country. Many of them have homes on it. These people are allowed to move their homes, but the question is, where?

There is a lot of land between Moanalua and Wahiawa, but the great share of Hawaii is controlled by a few big owners.

I asked a certain person familiar in real estate and found that many of these large landowners cannot sell because of certain restrictions written in the will by their former owners.

Well, I certainly don't want the dead to haunt me, but I believe that the question regarding subdivision must be solved now.

Take a ride from Honolulu to Wahiawa and you will find tremendous changes going on. I wouldn't be a bit surprised if within 10 years Moanalua, Aiea, Pearl City, and Waipahu become a part of Honolulu proper.

There are many acres of land in the above-mentioned places that are unsuitable for agriculture. These lands are paying a few dollars an acre in taxes, whereas, by dividing it into small lots and selling it through a priority system would mean a tremendous increase in revenue for our real property taxation bureau, and also would give more people a chance to own a piece of their country.

I believe postwar Hawaii will find our chief industries—sugar and pineapples—declining in importance.

Let's all try to look into the future. I'm sure you will all agree with me that the good old Hawaii is gone forever and a new speeded-up and modern Hawaii will be born.

Let's start in the right direction by paving the way to make this island a fast, streamlined, modern city. Oahu will be, in my opinion, the most important dot in the entire Pacific Ocean.

COUNTRY RESIDENT (*Pearl City*).

LIQUIDATION OF LARGE HOLDINGS OF LAND PROPOSED

Representative Hal F. Hanna, said today he will introduce Monday a bill to liquidate all land in excess of an appraised value of \$250,000 of any estate, trust corporation, charitable institution or other land-holding monopolies in the Territory.

Citing his reasons, he said the Bishop estate holds one-eleventh of all land in the Territory.

"As our population grows," Mr. Hanna said, "available freehold land becomes scarcer. Lands for home sites and business purposes are fast becoming unavailable.

"Most lands available are for leasehold only. There are no living heirs of the Bishop estate, which is for the sole purpose of perpetuating the Kamehameha schools.

"While the present administration of the Bishop estate is doing a wonderful job with the Kamehameha schools, I feel it should not be necessary for one-eleventh of the land of the Territory to be used to keep the schools going when they care for only several hundred students.

"Under the terms of this bill, for instance, it would be made mandatory upon the Bishop estate trustees to sell all Bishop estate lands in excess of \$250,000 and would with the further exception of the lands needed for immediate school use and turn the proceeds into good securities, using the dividends and interest thereon to support the Kamehameha schools.

"We feel that now is the time to liquidate Bishop estate property because of skyrocketing inflation of land prices and that interest and dividends from proceeds of the Bishop estate land will more than take care of the needs of the Kamehameha schools and also for their expansion in the future.

"In other words, I am for the Kamehameha schools 100 percent."

Areas in acres of all lands in the Territory of Hawaii, by approximate ownership and utilization—recent figures

A. Federal agencies-----	199,709
1. United States Army-----	24,770
2. United States Navy-----	12,284
3. National parks-----	162,047
4. Other-----	608
B. Public lands-----	1,588,430
5. Agricultural lands-----	41,070
(a) Sugarcane leases-----	30,000
(b) Pineapple leases-----	3,070
(c) Other agricultural-----	8,000
6. Pasture, all classes-----	637,840
7. Homesteads-----	22,870
8. House lots and business property-----	1,000
9. Reservations for public purposes-----	37,755
10. Forest reserves-----	698,216
11. Wastelands, roads, and highways-----	149,679
C. Private lands-----	2,312,341
12. Agricultural lands-----	300,421
(a) Sugarcane-----	237,834
(1) Owned by plantation-----	130,093
(2) Leased from large estates-----	79,062
(3) Small holdings, and planters-----	15,409
(4) Plantation environment-----	14,270
(b) Pineapple-----	55,158
(1) Owned by plantations-----	19,526
(2) Leased from large estates-----	29,444
(3) Small holdings and planters-----	5,000
(4) Plantation environment-----	1,188
(c) Other agricultural-----	7,429
13. Pasture land, all classes-----	1,442,160
(a) Large estates operating-----	1,000,000
(b) Large estates lessors-----	400,000
(c) Small ranches-----	42,160
14. Forest reserves-----	356,772
15. Wastelands, cities, and towns-----	230,908
Grand total-----	4,118,400

NOTE.—The only appreciable changes in land areas to date are due to the needs of the military—the Federal Government has taken over thousands of acres.

LAND OWNERSHIP IN HAWAII BY PERCENTAGE

The 100 largest owners and the Government own 91.3 percent.

The largest owner (the Bishop estate) owns more land than the masses (people of Hawaii).

Areas of 5,000 acres and over held by estates and individuals and closely held corporations. Does not include holdings by corporations with large lists of stockholders.

Bishop estate	374,000	Molokai ranch	69,000
Parker ranch	339,000	McCandless estate	39,000
Gay and Robinson	101,000	John II estate	19,000
Campbell estate	86,000	Austin estate	6,000
Shipman	74,000	Damon estate	5,000

LAND OWNERSHIP IN HAWAII BY PERCENTAGE

Government lands	43.5
Public lands	38.6
Federal lands	4.9
Private lands	56.5
Largest owner	9.1
10 largest owners (including largest owner)	28.6
Hundred largest owners (including 10 largest owners)	47.8
Other owners	8.7

OAHU, 1944 OWNERSHIPS AREA 386,560 ACRES, EFFECTIVE JAN. 1, 1944

No.	Nature of ownership	Area	Relative percentage to total
1	Trustees, B. P. Bishop estate	63,295.34	16.374
2	Trustees, James Campbell estate	51,619.99	13.353
3	Waialua Agricultural Co.	28,843.19	7.461
4	John II Estate, Ltd.	18,643.70	5.081
5	H. K. L. Castle	13,417.55	3.471
6	L. L. McCandless estate	9,902.47	2.561
7	Waianae Co.	9,176.26	2.374
8	Zions Securities Corp.	6,579.93	1.702
9	Trustees, S. M. Damon estate	5,815.12	1.504
10	M. P. Robinson estate	5,523.45	1.429
11	Mary E. Foster estate	4,701.53	1.216
12	Kualoa Ranch, Ltd.	3,986.86	1.031
13	J. W. Austin estate	2,926.46	.757
14	J. P. Mendonca trust estate	2,778.10	.718
15	George Galbraith trust estate	2,248.48	.581
16	Kahaluu land trust	2,229.26	.576
17	Robert Hind, Ltd.	2,119.47	.548
18	Hawaiian Avocado Co.	2,115.70	.547
19	Oahu Railway & Land Co.	1,763.95	.456
20	Mokuleia Ranch & Land Co.	1,641.89	.417
21	Trustees of Emma Kaleleonalani estate	1,601.38	.414
22	Roman Catholic Church	1,578.75	.408
23	Sing Chong Co.	1,422.83	.368
24	Hawaiian Pineapple Co., Ltd.	991.06	.256
25	Charlotte H. L. Cassidy et al.	913.38	.236
26	Hawaiian Land & Improvement Co., Ltd.	866.80	.224
27	Charles W. Lucas trust	791.71	.205
28	Wahiawa Water Co.	556.25	.144
	Total	249,023.85	64.412
	All other: Private owners	40,885.90	10.587
	Government lands:		
	Public lands:		
	Vacant, leased	15,394.95	3.982
	Department	33,978.94	8.790
	Hawaiian Homes Commission	941.50	.243
	City and county	735.08	.190
	Total	51,050.47	13.205
	Federal Government	45,599.78	11.796
	Total Government	96,650.25	25.001
	Grand total	386,560.00	100.000

NOTE.—3 largest, 37.188 percent; 4 largest, 42.269 percent; 5 largest, 45.740 percent; 10 largest, 55.310 percent.

June 8, 1945.

A. H. LANDGRAF, Jr.,
Assistant Assessor.

ISLAND OF OAHU (AREA, 386,560 ACRES)

	Areas in acres	Relative percentage of areas	Areas within forest reserve
Austin estate.....	2,926.460	0.76	
Bishop estate.....	63,295.340	16.37	(13,876.00)
Campbell estate.....	51,619.996	13.35	(8,390.10)
Castle, H. K. L.....	13,417.550	3.47	(1,378.30)
Damon estate.....	5,815.125	1.50	(2,909.00)
Queen Emma estate.....	1,601.380	.41	
Federal agencies (Army, Navy, etc.).....	45,599.760	11.80	
Il estate.....	19,643.706	5.08	(5,639.00)
Commissioner of public lands.....	15,394.950	3.98	
Other Territorial departments.....	33,978.940	8.79	(29,887.72)
Hawaiian Homes Commission.....	941.500	.24	
City and county of Honolulu.....	735.080	.19	
McCandless estate.....	9,902.471		
All others.....	121,687.722	31.48	
Total.....	386,560.000	100.00	

Approximate figures—Recent—Some military changes

ISLAND OF OAHU (AREA, 286,560 ACRES)

	Acreage, 1937	Acreage, 1945	Percent of total acreage
Bishop estate, Bernice P.....	64,102.820	63,295.340	16.37
Campbell estate, James.....	56,440.230	51,619.996	13.35
Waialua Agricultural Co.....	26,738.964		
Il estate.....	18,292.769	19,643.706	5.08
Castle, H. K. L.....	11,283.000	13,417.550	3.47

ISLAND OF HAWAII, AREA 2,579,200 ACRES

	Areas in acres	Relative percentage of areas	Areas within forest reserve
Campbell estate.....	25,999.200	1.01	
Bishop estate.....	292,750.930	11.35	
Parker ranch.....	339,472.620	13.16	(3,937.40)
Shipman ranch.....	74,182.940	2.88	
Ko'ala Sugar.....	14,764.620	.57	(2,737.65)
Commissioner of public lands.....	527,120.050	20.44	
Other Territorial departments.....	456,168.750	17.69	(453,837.77)
Hawaiian Homes Commission.....	91,589.870	3.55	(97.50)
County of Hawaii.....	566.930	.02	
Federal agencies (Army, Navy).....	151,842.810	5.89	
McCandless estate.....	29,919.120	1.16	
Greenwell estates.....	30,532.650	1.18	
All others.....	544,607.840	21.10	
Total.....	2,579,200.000	100.00	

ISLAND OF MOLOKAI, (AREA, 166,400 ACRES)

	Areas in acres	Relative percentage of areas	Areas within forest reserve
Molokai ranch.....	69,695.410	41.88	(4,607.00)
Puuohaku ranch (Fagan).....	13,867.820	8.33	
R. W. Meyer, Ltd.....	2,984.370	1.79	(1,706.36)
Commissioner of public lands.....	1,892.030	1.14	
Other Territorial departments.....	22,621.490	13.59	(14,138.58)
Hawaiian Homes Commission.....	25,892.100	15.56	
Federal agencies (Army, Navy).....	362.260	.22	
Bishop estate.....	4,717.240	2.83	
County of Kalawao.....	8,248.000	4.96	
All others.....	16,119.280	9.70	
Total.....	166,400.000	100.00	

ISLAND OF LANAI, (AREA 90,240 ACRES)

	Areas in acres	Relative percentage of areas	Areas within forest reserve
Commissioner of public lands.....	2,700.000		
Other Territorial departments.....	10,500.000	0.01	
Federal agencies (Army, Navy).....	11,350.000	.02	
Hawaiian Pine Co., Ltd.....	90,215.450	99.97	
Total.....	90,240.000	100.00	

ISLAND OF KAHOO LAWE, (AREA 28,823 ACRES)

Commissioner of public lands.....	28,799.700	99.92	
Federal agencies (Army, Navy).....	23.300	.08	
Total.....	28,823.000	100.00	

ISLAND OF KAUAI (AREA, 355,200 ACRES)

Bishop estate.....	10,746.800	3.02	
Rice, Ltd.....	4,131.290	1.16	
McBryde Sugar Co.....	12,210.650	3.44	(2,735.00)
Lihue Plantation Co., Ltd.....	43,582.490	12.26	(16,195.00)
Grove farm.....	14,518.000	4.09	
Knudsen estate.....	4,815.660	1.36	
Koloa Sugar Co.....	8,194.560	2.31	
Gay & Robinson.....	55,446.690	15.61	(3,024.00)
Kilauea Sugar Co.....	7,820.170	2.20	(2,089.71)
Commissioner of public lands.....	42,771.20	12.04	
Other Territorial departments.....	79,685.920	22.43	(78,815.21)
Hawaiian Homes Commission.....	27,979.350	7.88	(7,372.00)
County of Kauai.....	1,927.000	.54	
Federal agencies (Army, Navy).....	2,164.070	.61	
All others.....	29,207.150	11.04	
Total.....	355,200.000	100.00	

ISLAND OF NIIHAU (AREA, 46,080 ACRES)

Gay & Robinson.....	46,080.000	100.00	
---------------------	------------	--------	--

ISLAND OF MAUI (AREA, 465,920 ACRES)

East Maui Irrigation Co. Ltd.....	18,739.550	4.02	(14,215.50)
Maui Agricultural Co., Ltd.....	24,398.790	5.24	(1,231.90)
Hawaiian Commerce & Sugar Co.....	32,637.720	7.00	
Baldwin Packers.....	23,283.450	5.00	(8,320.00)
Haleakala ranch.....	30,070.540	6.45	(1,600.00)
Ulupalakua ranch.....	28,439.190	6.10	(3,972.00)
Kaupo ranch.....	9,989.240	2.14	
Maui Pineapple Co.....	6,646.310	1.43	
Austin estate.....	3,186.750	.68	
Campbell estate.....	8,960.527	1.92	
Bishop estate.....	2,546.100	.55	
Kaeleku Sugar Co. (Fagan).....	5,932.310	1.27	(859.00)
Commissioner of public lands.....	36,294.880	7.79	
Other Territorial departments.....	104,483.630	22.43	(103,541.54)
Hawaiian Homes Commission.....	20,175.500	4.33	(1,600.00)
Federal agencies (Army, Navy).....	17,347.470	3.72	
County of Maui.....	735.080	.15	
All others.....	92,052.963	19.77	
Total.....	465,920.000	100.00	

[Honolulu Advertiser and Honolulu Star-Dispatch, March 21]

GOVERNOR WOULD BUY LAND FOR HOME SITES—LAND MONOPOLIES THREATENED IN HOMES MOVE BY STAINBACK

Governor Stainback, in a special message to both branches of the territorial legislature today, recommended creation of the Hawaii Home Development Authority to meet Hawaii's critical needs for permanent homes.

The authority will have the right to acquire by purchase or eminent domain undeveloped lands for residential purposes within the area bounded by and including the districts of Moanalua and Waiawa, Oahu, from the sea to the mountains.

A bill embodying the Governor's proposals was introduced today by Representative Hal F. Hanna, of Maui.

The act calls for an initial loan to the authority of \$2,000,000 to be repaid the Territory as the authority obtains funds from its bonds, the issuance of which is provided by the act.

The house lots are to be developed by the authority ready for building homes when they will be sold to prospective builders.

The Governor's complete message follows:

"In my first message to you I pointed out that there exists on Oahu a grave shortage of lands available on the open market due to the land-holding policies of large land-holding monopolies, resulting in an unhealthy increase in the value of small areas which are available; and that this condition is so extreme as to render impracticable any scheme for adequate housing with private capital unless and until sufficient lands at reasonable prices can be made available.

"A study made by the Territorial planning board in 1938 disclosed that most of the privately owned lands in the Territory were then held by a few large estates, trustees, plantations, and individuals.

"This disclosed that the 100 largest landowners owned 47.8 percent of the total area, the Territory and Federal Governments 43.5 percent, and all others 8.7 percent. Certainly this is not a healthful situation * * *."

INTRODUCED BY HANNA

Governor Stainback's bill was introduced in the house yesterday by Representative Hal F. Hanna of Maui and went into the session records as H. B. 475. Representative Hanna told the press that he intends to present an amendment later which would extend the power of the proposed bill to the county of Maui.

Five commissioners, appointed by the Governor with approval of the senate, would make up the Authority. The Governor would appoint the first chairman. Initially, the commissioners would be named for 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 years, respectively, from the date of appointment. Thereafter the term of office would be 5 years.

The bill calls for an appropriation of \$2,000,000 from the general fund as an advance to the Authority. As it had the funds available, the Authority would reimburse the Territory for this amount.

Commissioners would receive no salaries but would be allowed necessary expenses incurred in the discharge of their duties. Whenever lands could not be procured through voluntary transactions, the Authority would be empowered to institute eminent-domain proceedings.

The new body would have authority to acquire any lands suitable for residential development, including roads, sidewalks, parks, schools, utilities, playgrounds and recreational facilities, water rights, and business to serve such residential areas.

RULES GIVEN

To be eligible to purchase a residence lot from the Authority a person must be (a) a citizen of the United States, (b) at least 21 years of age, and (c) a bona fide resident of the city-county or a veteran who has a bona fide intent to reside in the city-county.

If the number of eligible persons applying for purchase of lots were greater than the number of lots to be sold, the properties would be divided into two groups—one group for applicants who are veterans, and the second for other applicants.

In both groups, the choice of lots would be according to applicants' names, drawn from a receptacle. The person whose name was drawn first would have first choice of the available lots, and so on.

The bill provides that prices at which residential lots would be sold "shall be the fair and reasonable value as determined by appraisers appointed by the Authority." A purchaser could either pay the price in full or pay at least 50 percent of the purchase price at the outset and the balance in 24 equal monthly installments with 5-percent interest on unpaid balance.

Purchasers would not be permitted to resell lots within 2 years of the date of original sale and would be required to build homes upon the lots within 2 years

following the end of the war. No lot could be used for other than residential purposes, with certain specified exceptions, for a period of 10 years following the date of the original sale by the Authority.

[Honolulu Advertiser, April 29]

HANNA AGAIN STORM CENTER IN HOUSE ROW—VALLEY ISLE FIREBRAND STIRS UP RUCKUS WITH DEMAND ON FONG

Mau's peppery Representative Hal F. Hanna created more furor in the Territorial House of Representatives yesterday with his offering of a resolution (H. R. 86) mandating the judiciary committee headed by Representative Hiram L. Fong to report out H. G. 475, a measure calling for creation of an Hawaiian Home Development Authority and providing for the opening up of lands on Oahu for subdivision and sale as private home sites.

His resolution was immediately tabled, upon motion of Representative A. Q. Marcallino, by a vote of 16-3. For the next few minutes it was touch-and-go as to whether the resolution would even be permitted to go into the House Journal.

It was Representative C. E. Kauhane's motion that H. R. 86 be expunged from records of the session.

"If this resolution is expunged from the records," Representative Hanna declared, "the members of this house—or certain ones of them—are admitting that they are voting on measures on a basis of personal animosities and political friendships and ambitions instead of upon the merits of the bills themselves."

[Star-Bulletin]

HAWAII LAND "MONOPOLY" PROBE ASKED

A concurrent resolution asking Congress to appoint a committee to come to Hawaii to investigate "land monopolies" was offered today by Representative Hal F. Hanna.

The preamble reads:

"There now exists in the Territory a condition of land ownership that is not only undemocratic but inimical to the public welfare and interest.

"The largest owner owns one-eleventh of the land area of the Territory.

"The 10 largest land owners, including the largest owner, own over one-fourth of the land area of the Territory.

"The 100 largest owners, including the 10 largest owners, own almost one-half of the land area of the Territory.

"The largest land owner owns more than all the land owned in the Territory by its people.

"The land barons own six times as much land as the people of the Territory all together.

"The people of the Territory must have home sites."

The measure was referred to the lands committee.

(NOTE.—This resolution was killed in committee on public lands, 1945 session of the legislature. However, I sent 500 of the resolution to the National Congress on my own accord.

A HINT TO BIG LANDOWNERS

The Advertiser's position with regard to Hawaii's large land holdings is well known. The detrimental effect of private holding of extensive acreages in a community of this Territory's limited area is too self-evident to require argument. This newspaper repeatedly has expressed its opinion that in the public interest Hawaii's large estates should be broken up and made available for smaller ownerships and wider use.

At the same time, the Governor's proposal to accomplish this end by putting the Territory in the subdivision business does not offer a desirable remedy. Objections to making the Territorial land office a super real-estate agency are too obvious to require recounting. Furthermore, the expropriation of private property is not the American way and could be justified, if at all, only as a last resort in the face of a stubborn resistance by the large landowners to the needs of their less prosperous neighbors.

However, undesirable and unjust as such legislation would be, its proposal is a warning hint that wise landowners have no right to ignore. The writing is plain that unless Hawaii's land barons wisely take the initiative and voluntarily break up their swollen estates, an indignant public will do the job for them, right or wrong. It is evident, too, that popular opinion is such just now that there will be no brooking of unreasonable delay.

A sensible solution would be a declaration by the legislature that unless satisfactory progress toward the division of Hawaii's oversize landholdings is accomplished within the next 2 years, law to that end will be enacted. No landholder would dare attempt reprisal against a legislator who subscribed to this warning.

(The Honolulu Advertiser says land monopolies are very undemocratic. Not American. Even recognizes the fact that there are land barons in Hawaii.)

(NOTE.—Introduced in the house of representatives, 23d sess., Hawaii's 1945 Territorial legislature.)

H. Con. Res. No. 35. Concurrent resolution requesting the United States Congress to appoint a congressional committee to come to Hawaii to investigate the land monopolies now in existence

Whereas there now exists in the Territory a condition of land ownership that is not only undemocratic but inimical to the public welfare and interest; and Whereas the largest owner owns one-eleventh of the land area of the Territory of Hawaii; and

Whereas the 10 largest landowners (including the largest owner) owns over one-fourth of the land area of the Territory of Hawaii;

Whereas the 100 largest owners (including 10 largest owners) own almost one-half of the land area of the Territory of Hawaii; and

Whereas the largest landowner owns more than all the land owned in the Territory by its people; and

Whereas the land barons own six times as much land as the people of the Territory of Hawaii all put together; and

Whereas the people of the Territory of Hawaii must have home sites: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby memorialized to appoint a committee of that honorable body to proceed to the Territory of Hawaii to conduct a thorough investigation of the land monopolies in the Territory of Hawaii; and be it further

Resolved by said house of representatives, the senate concurring, That authenticated copies of this resolution be forwarded forthwith to the President, the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States of America; to the Secretary of the Interior; and to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii.

Offered by:

HAL F. HANNA,
Representative, Third District.

HONOLULU, T. H., March 16, 1945.

[Editorial, Honolulu Star-Bulletin, April 1945]

ICE-BOXING A GOOD BILL

More than a month ago, on March 20, Governor Stainback sent to both houses of the legislature a special message urging action to provide home sites on Oahu.

In the house, his message was followed by the introduction of a bill by Representative Hal F. Hanna, of Maui, embodying the Governor's recommendations. By agreement with the senate, no bill was introduced in the upper house. (This plan avoids needless duplication of legislation.)

The Governor's proposal was, and is, sound. It is timely. It aims to provide for poor, or only moderately well-to-do, tenants on Oahu the opportunity to own their homes.

It would set up a Territorial "home development authority" and make available \$2,000,000 to buy substantial undeveloped tracts of land on Oahu, by Government action, such lands to be cut up and sold to home builders.

Thus, eventually, the Territory would be reimbursed for its expenses, and many people now unable to buy house lots because of the staggering cost of real estate on this island, would be able to acquire such house lots at a reasonable price.

The value of such action is obvious. There may be differences on minor phases of the Governor's proposal but its objective is logical and the remedy for homelessness is desperately needed.

Moreover, as the Governor's plan neither duplicates nor conflicts with current Federal emergency housing plans but would effectively supplement them, the time for the action he suggests is now.

To date Representative Hanna's bill is stymied in the house. It has been lodged in the judiciary committee.

Will it continue to be stymied?

Perhaps because Mr. Hanna has irritated house members (and others) by indiscretions in some of his public statements; perhaps for other reasons, the bill which bears his name is being given the well-known cold storage treatment. It rests in the house "ice box."

One of the "other reasons" for which the bill has been ice-boxed may be the impression—which personal red opponents of Governor Stainback have sought to create—that the homesite purchase plan he recommends is "too advanced." Its opponents have labeled it "socialistic."

(Some of these same opponents have been the loudest shouters for emergency housing action. They see nothing socialistic in Federal or Territorial appropriations for either temporary or permanent housing construction, at Government expense, but they pretend to smell the awful taint of "socialism" on a project which aims to make it possible for people ultimately to own their homes.)

It will be unfortunate if the legislature adjourns without constructive action on this forward-looking plan.

And if it does adjourn without constructive action, the question will arise, inevitably, what maneuvers, influences, and pressures operated to kill off a measure aimed to benefit now homeless people?

The least that can now be done is a committee report that definitely favors the principle of the measure; and that calls for complete study during the next 2 years and action in 1947 based on that study.

(NOTE.—This editorial in resolution form was offered by myself, in the house of representatives, and it has been spread upon the pages of the official House Journal, despite the efforts of Representative Charles Kauhane to have it expunged from the records. P. 1273.)

The following are statements made, during a judiciary committee meeting in Iolani Palace, by Representative Hiram Fong and Hebden Porteus (referring to H. B. 475, homes authority bill):

"There is no definite need of opening up lands now. * * *"

"It would be impossible to build now, anyway."

"H. B. 475 will be killed in the senate, so why pass it in the house?"

"The judiciary committee should not take the responsibility of passing this type of bill."

"Not effective; the people are just worrying about war housing."

"Nothing so radical on land in the last 900 years."

"Radical departure of convention."

Representative Hiram Fong was chairman of the important judiciary committee.

People can't live in convention; they must have homes to live in. Firstly, however, they must have lots to build homes on. The 1945 legislature had an opportunity to help the people of this Territory acquire homesites. This homes authority bill died a gruelling death in the judiciary committee.

After an attempt to dynamite the bill out of committee, it was reported out and assigned to the holdover committee. There is no holdover committee.

Many people have wondered why Speaker Paschoal assigned this bill, carrying an appropriation of \$2,000,000, to the judiciary committee instead of the finance committee, where it rightfully should have gone.

Mr. Fong made the statement that the judiciary committee could stand on its own two feet.

Many wonder why the committee didn't stand on its two feet and fight for the rights of the people as far as homesites were concerned.

Why did the former Territorial land commissioners "literally give" thousands of acres of Hawaii's land leases to the big interests of the Territory for a mere song? Were these commissioners controlled?

Today in Hawaii, the people are finding it almost impossible to purchase land under any condition.

Did you know that:

The big land leasers in Hawaii pay an average yearly rental of only 27 cents per acre, to the Territory for pastoral lands?

The big land leasers in Hawaii pay an average yearly rental of only \$7 to \$8 per acre, to the Territory, for lands being used to grow sugarcane and pineapple on?

(This is outrageous. The Territory realizes only \$139,000 a year from leases on pastoral lands. These consist of over a half million acres.)

Realization from leases on sugarcane and pineapple land are only \$290,000 a year?

(Yet when more money must be raised through taxation, what happens? The masses get it in the neck. The big interests continue merrily along, paying very little for their lucrative leases.)

The total revenue to the Territory of Hawaii for all land leases per year is only \$1,247,891.05?

(In a community as wealthy as Hawaii, somebody is getting away with something.)

All lands in the Territory of Hawaii should be reclassified and the correct rates should be established.

The Territory of Hawaii receives too little for her land leases.

(NOTE: Following are a few who lease land from the Territory:

List of existing general leases and licenses as of June 30, 1944

No.	Lessee	Land	Area (acres)	Annual rental	Used for—	Cost per acre
1956	W. H. Shipman, Ltd.	Keonepoloiki-Makuu, Puna.	15,345.15	\$2,080.00	Pasture.....	\$0.136
1971	Richard Smart.....	Humuula, North Hilo.	44,280.00	22,232.70	do.....	.502
2786	W. H. Shipman, Ltd.	Piihonua, Waiakea.	13,335.00	9,580.00	do.....	.718
1900	Richard Smart.....	Puukapa, pasture lots, South Kohala.	9,988.70	5,915.00	do.....	.592
1901	do.....	Honokaia, Hamakua.	3,274.00	3,285.00	do.....	1.004
1902	do.....	Nienie, Hamakua.	6,495.00	7,165.00	do.....	1.103
1904	do.....	Kamoku-Kapulena, Hamakua.	2,991.67	844.00	do.....	.282
1909	Kukaiiau Ranch Co....	Kahe II, Hamakua....	853.00	650.00	do.....	.762
1910	do.....	do.....	13,950.00	3,605.00	do.....	.258
1911	do.....	Kahe VI, Hamakua....	3,140.00	850.00	do.....	.271
1912	do.....	Hoea-Kaao, Hamakua.	1,902.00	705.00	do.....	.371
1973	Richard Smart.....	Kahe III, Hamakua....	12,131.00	4,100.00	do.....	.338
2434	Kahua Ranch Co.....	Pahinahina, North Kohala.	5,328.50	1,000.00	do.....	.188
2769	Kohala Sugar Co.....	Hualua, North Kohala.	1,289.00	3,850.00	Sugarcane.....	2.990
1919	Hutchinson Sugar.....	Kamaoa-Puueo, Kau.	6,209.53	1,226.00	Pasture.....	.193
1920	Hawaiian Agricultural Co.	Kapapala, Kau.....	38,387.00	4,300.00	do.....	.112
2257	Robinson A. McWayne.	Honomalina, South Kona.	2,720.00	100.00	do.....	.0368
2262	Hutchinson Sugar....	Hionaa Kaalaiki, Kau.	2,195.85	1,250.00	Pasture and sugar.	.569
2263	do.....	Waiohinu, Kau.....	3,912.19	1,050.00	do.....	.268
2265	Hawaiian Agricultural Co.	Kaalaala, Kau.....	1,405.61	100.00	Pasture.....	.071
2399	Hutchinson Sugar.....	Kaunamano, Kau.....	929.76	1,402.00	Pasture and sugar.	1.508
2621	Robert Hind, Ltd.....	Puanahulu, North Kona.	123,945.54	15,105.00	Pasture.....	.122

List of existing general leases and licenses as of June 30, 1944—Continued

No.	Lessee	Land	Area (acres)	Annual rental	Used for—	Cost per acre
2860	Alfred Hartwell Carter, treasurer.	Kukuio-Ooma, North Kona.	15, 723. 00	\$600. 00	Pasture.....	\$0. 0382
1458	Ulupalakua ranch	Kahikinui.....	12, 655. 00	1, 267. 00	do.....	. 10
1706	East Maui Irrigation Co.	Koolau Forest.....	15, 387. 00	26, 500. 00	Water licensing...	. 728
1737	Ulupalakua Ranch	Kualapa-Onau.....	2, 799. 48	1, 250. 00	Pasture.....	. 454
1833	Dwight Baldwin	Kalepa, Kaupo.....	321. 83	210. 00	do.....	. 683
1927	do.....	Nakula Mauka, Kaupo.	1, 536. 00	300. 00	do.....	. 195
1949	H. W. Rice	Ukumehame, Lahaina	4, 896. 28	1, 203. 00	do.....	. 246
1989	Dwight Baldwin	Manawainui, Kaupo	361. 40	70. 00	do.....	. 194
2151	Harold W. Rice	Waiohuli-Keokea	5, 920. 50	5, 500. 00	do.....	. 93
2341	Kahoolawe Ranch	Island of Kahoolawe	28, 800. 00	100. 00	do.....	. 0035
2384	Kaeleku Sugar Co.	Honomaale-Hana	1, 066. 50	1, 350. 00	Pasture and wasteland.	. 265
2819	Ulupalakua Ranch	Honuaula.....	8, 370. 00	1, 100. 00	Pasture.....	. 132
2879	Pioneer Mill Co.	Lahaina.....	1, 153. 32	4, 895. 00	Pasture and sugar.	4. 245
2921	Ulupalakula Ranch	Kakikinui.....	14, 225. 00	1, 267. 00	do.....	. 089

Note the small cost—per acre—per year.

[Hawaii Sentinel, October 21, 1937]

CONGRESS TO END RULE OF BI-NATIONAL COMBINE; OPEN TO PEOPLE

Land uses in Hawaii are to be revolutionized.

Huge estates in perpetuity must go.

Lease of vast acreages of government lands to plantations must cease.

Big ranches for cattle raising must give way to farm homes for American homesteaders.

Varied agriculture for food supply must supplant sugar and pineapples in a new national policy.

Americanism, safety and defense must replace commercialism, profits and one-industry land monopoly as keystones of Hawaii government.

Island control by and for a small group of powerful men and corporations must give way to democracy and a planned economy.

Our local government set-up provided by the organic act must be scrapped and replaced with a new system designed to end binationalism and autocratic rule for a plunderbund.

Such are the high light results of two weeks of hard, intensive work by the Congressional Joint Commission on statehood which is leaving here for Washington this week.

President Roosevelt and all his Cabinet will get strong urgings for fast action on the new plan as soon as the Commission members reach Washington.

Legislation to start creation of the new set-up is to be laid down for Executive approval for immediate action before the Congress convening in extra session November 15.

The whole program is germane to the purpose of the special session as set out in President Roosevelt's call—agricultural reform, national safety, international peace.

Overwhelming and united opinion of the Commission is back of the new program.

Basis for it are the wholesale evidences of misgovernment and national perils uncovered by the Commission in Hawaii.

Vital needs, the Commission majority agree, include changes to strip control of Hawaii from local hands, creation of a new lay-out for gradual Americanization of present peoples, farm immigration of Americans from mainland States to build up a strong middle class of nationals.

Ultimate population of 1,500,000 to 2,000,000 is foreseen and planned for, with a self-sustaining, diverse agriculture assuring end of Hawaii's food problem in event of Pacific conflict.

This means victory for the War and Navy Departments in their demands for revising Hawaii's economic set-up.

It means myriad small farms for stock, grains, tropical fruits, specialty crops, in place of sugar areas of thousands of acres.

John E. Rankin, ranking member of the House Territories Committee, voiced the new Hawaii policy and the intent of the Commission flowing from its probe of Hawaiian conditions.

"Our national prosperity and safety and that of your Hawaiian Islands depends upon creation of a group of small, independent, strong, middle-class home owners here."

We wonder what happened? Congress did not alleviate this condition. Lands in Hawaii are still in a state of monopoly by a few.

LAND—LAND—LAND—LAND—LAND—LAND

Of the four-odd million acres of land in the Territory of Hawaii, the landholding monopolies and the government own approximately 92 percent of this acreage. If, according to Mr. Maverick * * * "Land is liberty" * * * then the landholding companies in Hawaii thrive on 92 percent of the liberties. There is no question as to their economic security.

We were wondering about the peoples' liberties.

This is a very unbalanced situation and it isn't due to the fact that the people do not have the money to buy land but, rather, lands are not made available for purchase.

As I look around me, in Hawaii, I see many thousands of acres of land of every description. There is an abundance of good land, yet it is almost impossible to buy a decent house lot for a reasonable price. A price that a workman can afford.

There is so little land available for homesites that the cost on real estate has skyrocketed out of proportion to the actual value.

The reason for this problem, is the one of supply and demand. This condition is a false one, however, for there are innumerable sites in Hawaii that could be subdivided and made available to the people * * * without disrupting our island industries in the least.

It is a fundamental democratic principle, to be able to own your home. It makes for a better citizenry. Citizens who own their homes take a more active interest in the community in which they live. A person feels more secure. Family life is more pleasant. Home owners are the backbone of our great Nation. Remember, just as the pulse goes of a people making up a nation * * * so goes the nation's heartbeat.

Then there is a question of business locations. This is Territory-wide. Surely Hawaii's big interests are not afraid of competition. Competition is healthy in any community. There seem to be many fine sites for business locations, but upon inquiry, they are not for sale. In fact, it is impossible to buy land of any sort, in many of Hawaii's small plantation towns. The tendency seems to be one of throttling free enterprise.

THIS IS A VERY UNHEALTHY CONDITION

Other than the civilian population, our returning servicemen will be in the market for homesites and business locations, and at a figure within their means. Our soldiers are fighting on the battlefields of the world * * * for democracy and the preservation of all they hold dear. This includes their home life and the right to purchase a piece of land on which to build their homes. It will be a shallow victory for our soldiers if when they return home they find that there is no land available for home sites in Hawaii. Their homeland for which they fought so valiantly.

MORE LAND MUST BE OPENED TO THE PUBLIC

Following are a few suggestions:

1. Large estates in the Territory should either be liquidated or large portions of the estates should be subdivided and opened to the public in fee simple. The people do not want leases * * * they want to purchase these lands.

2. There is much land along Hawaii's highways that would make excellent home and business sites.

3. The sugar and pineapple plantations should open up lands that are not being used for crops.

4. The Territory should open government land and also condemn private lands that are not for the good of the welfare of the people (large land monopolies).

Land is the key to all wealth and economic freedom in Hawaii—

Land monopoly by a few is both undemocratic and un-American.

THIS CONDITION EXISTS IN HAWAII—AND THERE MUST BE A CHANGE

The people of Hawaii need home sites. Home sites that are within the reach of the average man. The people need business locations, homestead lands, small farm and agricultural lands.

It is the duty of the Territorial legislature to enact legislation to meet these needs. They have not done this—house bill 475 (Hawaiian homes authority bill) failed to receive fair treatment in the last legislature. This far-reaching bill would have helped the land problem in Hawaii. It died in the house judiciary committee, over the protest of Representative Herbert K. H. Lee.

If the Territorial legislature will not take action maybe Congress will.

(NOTE.—Follow the directions on the next page.)

WRITE OR WIRE THE HONORABLE JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON, HAWAII'S DELEGATE TO CONGRESS

TELL HIM THAT THE PEOPLE OF HAWAII NEED HOME SITES!

EXHIBIT 48. PRESENTED BY HAL HANNA

BIG 5 MONOPOLY IN HAWAII

(By Representative Hal Hanna, member, house of representatives, Territorial legislature)

FOREWORD

In all the world there's no lovelier place to live than the islands of Hawaii.

It may seem strange to have read this, when you have begun the pages which follow; for the story they tell is an ugly one. But it is not the story of the physical charms of Hawaii. That—*Aloha Oe!*—has been written by more gracious writers, many hundreds of them. This is an attempt to tell about the men of Hawaii and to describe the incredible conflict which, under a cloak of tropic calm, has been taking place among them. It is told now because their struggle has reached a turning point. The suddenness of the impact of war was enough to set long-smoldering elements of conflict into violent motion. And now a new order is being established in Hawaii, replacing the old system of polite tyranny which ruled the islands for more than a century.

The handful of men whose word hitherto had been almighty in Hawaii may seem to emerge out of the following pages as ogres full-blown, evil men without scruple. That is not their nature. Almost without exception, the autocrats who ruled Hawaii are men with a highly inbred sense of righteousness. They are men with too deeply inherent a conscience to depart one iota from their code. But that precisely was the key to their wickedness.

It was this code and the ruthless manner in which they enforced it that made of Hawaii a community in chains. The code was harsh and on the surface it was outdated. At first glance it seemed to be a remnant of the fire and brimstone fervor with which the missionary forebears of these autocrats ruled the islands after their arrival in 1820. Missionary descendants kept their tight grip on the island community because they had discovered it was something worth holding

on to. Destiny had passed their role on to them and their task was a holy one which kept them tremendously rich.

So, by the twentieth century, there was more than religious zeal behind their code. Something very ominous had been added. It was something which reached out and vitally influenced the lives of every one of Hawaii's half-million people; it had become a coldly calculated system of political, economic, and social control. What they had developed in these lush tropic surroundings was a near-perfect blueprint for—no, not merely for fascism; it was more deceptive, yet more inclusive than that. It was a process of rule by the few so foreign to democracy that it will seem incredible for it to have survived so long under the American flag.

—From the book, *Revolt in Paradise*, by Alexander MacDonald.

DEDICATION

This little booklet is dedicated to the good people of the Territory of Hawaii and to the cause of democracy in its full meaning.

I do not mean to be vindictive, but, rather, I feel that the true way of American democracy is at its best, when its subjects can take it—as well as give it. By this I mean, precisely, that the large corporations in Hawaii can take a lesson in consideration and understanding. The big interests of the Territory of Hawaii, are not above reproach and should learn how to take criticism as well as give it.

The feudal Hawaii of yesteryear is gone forever and the sooner everyone in Hawaii comes to this realization the sooner Hawaii will come into its own. A truly democratic community.

Monopoly, suppression, and intimidation in these islands must give way to the oft spoken, "Live and let live."

H. F. H.

THE FORTY-NINTH STATE

"Hawaii is by no means ready to join the sisterhood of States—due to the unhealthy state of control of her economic set-up, legislature, police, and judiciary."

—Henry Rudin, former recreational director of Waialua Plantation.

"Rarely have I visited a place where there is so much charity and so little democracy as in Hawaii."

—Ray Stannard Baker, *American Magazine*.

"That it is a system is the trouble. If it was merely a temporary combination of evil-minded men their dispersal would be all that would be required, but what has grown up in Hawaii is akin to the development of the slave power in the United States."

—W. A. Kinney, petition to United States Congress, 1928.

"Up to now the Asiatic has had only an economic value in the social equation. So far as the institutions, laws customs, and language of the permanent population go, his presence is no more felt than is that of the cattle on the ranges."

—Royal Mead, Hawaiian Sugar Planters Association Secretary, in *The Sugar Industry and Hawaii*, 1910.

"As has been emphasized again and again, the primary function of our plantations is not to produce sugar but to pay dividends."

—Richard A. Cooke, Annual Hawaiian Sugar Planters Association Meeting, 1929.

"I can see little difference between the importation of foreign laborers and the importation of jute bags from India."

—Richard A. Cooke, Hawaiian Sugar Planters Association President, 1930.

"The chief objective of industry is not the accumulation of wealth for a few, but providing a way for the social order to be more successful as a whole."

—President David L. Crawford, University of Hawaii, 1936.

"Hawaii is the all-important bastion of the Nation's defense in the Pacific. In peacetime, it is one of the world's pleasantest and most interesting communities, a vast domain worthy of becoming the forty-ninth of the United States.

"But Hawaii is likewise the all-too-exclusive preserve, for fat profit, of a little handful of families whose feudal rule—through their Big Five corporate monopolies—is so tight and complete that even the Army on occasion finds its wishes quietly ignored and its plans stalled.

"The situation is an amazing anachronism, a survival of the 'public-be-damned' era of an earlier America."

—Feudal Hawaii: Paradise, Ltd., Stanley High, Reader's Digest, June 1943.

FOREWORD

I have compiled this booklet to give the people of the Territory of Hawaii a clear picture of a monopoly by a handful of supposedly benevolent autocrats who hold the economic reins of Hawaii in a tight-fisted control. This monopoly reaches into every phase of island life.

MONOPOLY BY A FEW IS UNDEMOCRATIC AND UN-AMERICAN

Henry A. Wallace, until recently Vice President of the United States and now Secretary of Commerce, had this to say in his article in the Reader's Digest of recent issue:

"I am against a planned economy. It means tyranny. It means that all the economic decisions would be made by a small group at a central spot."

Mr. Wallace says he believes in planning, but he means by planning to keep our economic system free from the hands of a few directors of a few large corporations. Private totalitarianism.

Secretary of Commerce Wallace's statement made in general certainly refers to a like conditions in Hawaii, whereby a few Republican autocrats make all the decisions that affect everyone's life in Hawaii. All the economic decisions in Hawaii are made by the Big Five.

This concentration of economic power in Hawaii has proven itself, for over a century, to be tyrannical. Too few directors of a few large corporations hold too much power in a small central spot. The inclination for intimidation has a long, sorry record.

Now, you might say that I am against wealth—the capitalistic system—Hawaii's great industries, etc. You might say that I am a radical, a rabble-rouser, prolabor, etc.

This is not true. Criticism paves the way for progress. A man is not radical because he champions the rights of the masses—because he wants to see a fairer distribution of wealth for the workingman.

I am 100 percent for the big interests in Hawaii. Just because I voice legitimate criticism, does not mean that I am against the industry of Hawaii. No; it's simply that some of the principles by which they rule, are offensive! I am desirous of labor and management getting together on an equal footing and working their industrial relations out to the best interests of both parties.

The argument that no one ever starved in Hawaii is not a good one. People can have their stomachs full and still not be able to express their opinions. This is a form of serfdom and it has been and is prevalent in Hawaii. Many people are afraid of reaction for an expression of opinion. This intimidation and coercion must cease.

Small independent businessmen within the Territory and large outside capital have been throttled from getting a share of island business by the big business monopoly in Hawaii. Competition is healthy in any community. It was a problem for such stores as S. H. Kress Co. and Sears, Roebuck & Co. to get a foothold in Hawaii. These stores have given the Big Five much competition and have been a godsend to the people of the islands. Outside capital should be welcome. Live and let live.

The two-crop system of sugar and pineapple must be supplemented by diversified agriculture, to a great extent.

H. F. H.

"Labor is prior to and independent of capital. Capital is only the fruit of labor, and could never have existed if labor had not first existed. Labor is the superior of capital and deserves much the higher consideration."

—Abraham Lincoln (First Annual Message to Congress, December 1861).

In his very frank exposé of conditions in the Hawaiian Islands, Mr. John P. Frank, author of *Hawaii Before Pearl Harbor and Martial Law in Hawaii*, gives his audience a true-to-life picture in the following articles which appeared in the *Columbia Law Review* of September 1944.

We quote—*Hawaii Before Pearl Harbor*:

"To understand the impact of martial law on a social system it is necessary to know something of what the social system is; and an appraisal of martial law in Hawaii since Pearl Harbor requires some knowledge of Hawaii before that time. The principal islands of Hawaii were first discovered and named the Sandwich Islands by Capt. James Cook in 1788. At that time the islands were governed as separate principalities by separate rulers, but in 1795 King Kamehameha I extended dominion over the group. Thereafter the islands were visited from time to time by traders, and in 1820 the first missionaries arrived. These missionaries in many cases remained as businessmen. Two of them, Amos Cooke and Samuel Castle, became the founders of one of the principal commercial companies in the islands today: Castle & Cooke. Throughout the nineteenth century representatives of several nations competed for the most influential position in the islands, but eventually the American group prevailed. Americans developed the sugar and pineapple industries, and in due course five major companies, which began as sugar factories, became the controlling economic force in the islands. In 1893 the American group conducted a successful revolution against the monarchy and established a republic. The republic immediately petitioned for annexation by the United States and was annexed during the Spanish-American War in 1898. In 1900 the Hawaiian organic act was passed by Congress.

"In order to maintain an adequate labor supply, the plantation owners imported labor on a contract basis, principally from Japan and the Philippine Islands. These laborers came in great numbers, quickly outnumbering the native population. They were hired on a contract basis which was little better than slavery, and the debates in Congress on the passage of the organic act in 1900 are replete with tales of extreme brutalities suffered by the contract workers. The original draft of the organic act, prepared by a group of representatives of former Hawaiian Republic, including Sanford B. Dole, and a group of Congressmen, permitted continuance of the contract-labor system, but this was forbidden by the Congress.

"The development of Hawaii since 1900 is the story of the development of the sugar, pineapple, and tourist industries under the control of five companies. These companies, by a system of interlocking marriages and directorates, have kept economic and political dominion of the islands among a small group of families. When the organic act was passed, it was accepted without question that Hawaii was to be governed by a ruling class of approximately 4,000 Americans and other Anglo-Saxon peoples, who were to have dominion over the remaining 145,000 residents of the islands.

"Particular provisions of the basic law were specifically described by Senator Platt, who favored those provisions, as aimed at maintenance of the governing class. In the intervening 44 years the islands have grown to 450,000 people, but the controlling group has maintained its dominion. That controlling group built up the industries of the islands and in return dominated the Territory. The unity of economic control may be seen most vividly by a comparison of the interlocking directorates and top management of one of the five companies with the remainder of Hawaiian industry. This company's officers and directors occupy similar positions in 28 sugar plantations, 3 irrigation companies, 3 other of pineapple companies, 2 steam-navigation companies, 2 newspapers, 2 insurance companies, and 17 other miscellaneous concerns. The total capitalization of those enterprises is far over \$100,000,000.

"Labor unions have led a precarious existence in an economy which is still only a short 40 years removed from almost pure feudalism. The attitude of the employing group has been described by a dispassionate observer as benevolently paternalistic, and the history of Hawaiian management is said to be one of antagonism to labor organization."

Important plantation strikes occurred in 1919, 1920, and in 1924 when Philippine workers struck for a \$2, 8-hour day, and again in 1937. Nonplantation organization received its first impetus from the Wagner Act, and according to one estimate there were only 500 persons in the Territory affiliated with national unions in 1935. In 1939 there were between 3,500 and 6,000 union members. However, acceptance of the Wagner Act came slowly, and the president of the

Hawaiian Industrial Association was quoted in 1937 as saying that he "paid as little attention to the Wagner Act as he did to the Desha bathing-suit law."

The relations of labor, the Big Five, the police, and the Army are well described in a 1937 report of a National Labor Relations Board trial examiner in a case involving one of the Big Five and the longshoremen's union:

"No impartial person who heard the demeanor of witnesses on the stand and who heard the testimony and read the record and all of the exhibits offered at the hearing, could fail to be impressed with the fact that the longshoremen in the employ of respondents are afraid, and they have reason to be. Their employer controls virtually the entire economic life of the Territory. To be discharged as a longshoreman at the port of Honolulu means either that one must eke out a living fishing or go as a suppliant to one of the other enterprises owned by Castle & Cooke, Ltd., and seek employment. If one makes a remark that reflects in any manner on Castle & Cooke, Ltd., it is sure to get back to the management, and one is called on the carpet for it. An employee must remember this even when seeking relaxation in drink, for his irresponsible statements made under the influence of liquor are reported and he is penalized just as if they were made when sober. The police department works with respondent to check any untoward activity, and this is well understood. Moreover, the Army Intelligence cooperates with the Industrial Association of Hawaii, and the latter, in turn, is managed by an attorney for respondent, Castle & Cooke, Ltd.

"The mores of the Territory provide no place for a union of any of the employed inhabitants, and consequently activity in looking toward such union organization and moves made toward it which are commonplace on the mainland become endowed with portentous and revolutionary significance when seen through island eyes. It is not a healthy condition. * * *

It was this Hawaii, a paternalistic paradise, which the Japanese bombs struck on December 7, 1941.

THE ADMINISTRATION OF MARTIAL LAW

Martial law when it governs a population for 2½ years is the foundation of a social system. Military government of this kind is no fleeting display of uniformed power seeking to control a military calamity. It is a system of law making and law administration which basically directs the life of a people. The Duncan and White cases insofar as they involve general legal principles should not be considered in a factual vacuum. The social system which the military authorities have created or preserved must be known if one is to understand as a practical matter the "necessity" of martial law.

After December 7, 1941, military control was extended to every aspect of civil life. It governed not only the courts, but municipal affairs; operation of taxis, rent control, garbage disposal, house numbering, traffic, labor, press censorship, civilian defense, health, jails, prices, liquor, food control, transportation, gas rationing, and almost everything else under the Hawaiian sun. At very few of these responsibilities did the military authorities show any great degree of either skill or judgment. High military officials were readily amenable to the persuasive blandishment of island society, and, as will be shown, the bulk of the military-control program was of a sort more satisfactory to local business than to any other group in the islands' population.

One of the military's experiments was its attempt to encourage food production. Due to shipping shortages, the Territory has a basic problem in wartime in supplying itself with food, particularly vegetables normally brought from the mainland. One method of increasing vegetable production would be to cut down on pineapple and sugar acreage, using these lands for more immediate purposes. General Emmons appointed as director of food production Walter F. Dillingham, member of one of the Big Five families. One of the first decisions of the new food director was to oppose all efforts to take land from the pineapple and sugar industries for food production.

Perhaps the most serious problem of the islands was inflation. The flush of Government money was felt in all its force. Honolulu became a boom town. Merchants, jewelers, amusement-place operators, and others made tremendous profits. One result was a tremendous growth in the middle class. Another was a sharp rise in prices. The military authorities met this situation by an attempted price control, which was a failure until OPA took over the job, and by a wage freeze for employees in the islands. Thus the employees were caught with prices on the rise and wages relatively stable.

On December 1, 1942, Mr. Garner Anthony, attorney general of Hawaii, submitted a report to the recently appointed Governor, Ingram M. Stainback. The following paragraphs describe the practical operation of the military "judicial" system as seen by Mr. Anthony:

"In place of the criminal courts of this Territory there have been erected on all the islands provost courts and military commissions for the trial of all manner of offenses from the smallest misdemeanor to crimes carrying the death penalty. Trials have been conducted without regard to whether or not the subject matter is in any manner related to the prosecution of the war. These military tribunals are manned largely by Army officers without legal training. Those who may have had any training in the law seem to have forgotten all they ever knew about the subject.

"Lawyers who appear before these tribunals are frequently treated with contempt and suspicion. Many citizens appear without counsel; they know, generally speaking, that no matter what evidence is produced the 'trial' will result in a conviction. An acquittal before these tribunals is a rare animal. Accordingly, in most cases a plea of guilty is entered in order to avoid the imposition of a more severe penalty. Those who have the temerity to enter a plea of not guilty are dealt with more severely for having chosen that course.

"The accused is not furnished with a copy of the charge against him but is permitted to examine the prosecutor's copy. Trials take place in crowded courtrooms in which the officers in charge are fully armed. The witnesses are brought before the provost judges en masse and stand in a circle about the bench together with the accused. The assemblage tells the judge their views of the matter. Cross-examination of witnesses is tolerated with none too much patience by the court.

"There have been instances in which arrests have been made and the accused kept in jail 3 or 4 days awaiting trial, even in the case of comparatively minor offenses. With the writ of habeas corpus suspended the unfortunate accused in such cases is without remedy.

"The 'military governor' has appointed what he styles a coordinator of courts. At the present time this is Capt. Edward N. Sylva, who was formerly one of the deputies in this office. I am informed that as cases come in Mr. Sylva makes a determination whether or not they should be tried by the courts of the land or tried before the military tribunals. His determination is final.

"The proceedings in these military tribunals are not only shocking to a lawyer but to anyone with a sense of fair play. Severe and bizarre sentences are meted out by persons untrained in the law. The feeling of the public is that they are guilty before they step inside the courtroom and their main problem is to escape with as light a sentence as possible."

The press has been censored without any regard to the nonmilitary nature of the matters controlled. For example, the press was not permitted to publish news of local crimes or to discuss the control of prostitution. An editorial mildly criticizing the military administration in one newspaper brought forth a prompt reprimand for the editor and notification that such criticism would not be tolerated by the self-styled military governor.

In the Duncan case, Governor Stainback, in the course of testimony, asserting that martial law was utterly unnecessary and illegal, declared that the principal reason for retaining martial law was the desire by some persons to perpetuate the system of labor control instituted under it. This is probably the prime reason why martial law has lasted so long. Administration of labor problems by the military is therefore worth careful consideration.

As has been shown above, union membership in Hawaii under Big Five anti-labor practices was very small in 1935, and had grown to about 10,000 in December 1941. Thereafter, membership fell to about 4,000 as a result of the general confusion and the insecurity of persons of Japanese descent. A rise in union membership then began which, according to some reports, has now reached almost 20,000. This rise has been fought all along the line, and the military labor policies have made sound unionization particularly difficult.

On December 20, 1941, General Order No. 38 was issued, freezing jobs and wages. On January 26, 1942, General Order No. 56 created a director of labor control, a position to which a civilian plantation manager was appointed. On March 31, 1942, General Order No. 38 was revoked and General Order No. 91 was issued, making some wage adjustments on Government projects; requiring a 48-hour week on war projects, with time and a half for work over 48 hours; continuing a substantial job freeze; requiring that employees with frozen jobs

report for work regularly; and setting up an appeals agency for employees discharged with prejudice. On May 6, 1942, General Order No. 91 was amended to permit some relief from the wage freeze, but there was no substantial improvements in conditions. Subsequently, a 40-cent minimum wage was ordered which had very little consequence in a territory already in the grip of inflation. As of March 1, 1943, there were still 110,000 workers frozen in their jobs.

Any resemblance between these labor controls and those applied on the mainland are more superficial than real. The wage and job freeze not only preceded those of the mainland, but were surrounded with none of the safeguards of individual rights applied on the continent. The freezes were established not after consultation with the workers involved but by fiat, and no genuine machinery was established for the alleviation of hardships. As recently as the summer of 1944, when War Labor Board Chairman Davis went to Hawaii, the first steps were still being taken to establish any agency which could effectively adjust wage inequities to meet a rising cost of living. In Hawaii a wage and job freeze was in truth a perpetuation of every traditional injustice. But greater than all other differences was the fact that in Hawaii alone has the violation of job-freeze orders been enforced by prison sentences levied by military courts.

The labor control board, established by the military authorities to hear the appeals of employees discharged with prejudice, was virtually moribund. Headed by a succession of plantation executives, it was always so heavily stacked in favor of employers that few ever supposed that it would function impartially and almost no cases were brought to it.

At the same time, the prison population increased as the military court vigorously enforced the job freeze by jailing any employees who did not report for work. These cases were tried with as little regard for constitutional process as would be expected from the description above of the provost courts. In 1943 the number of such cases rose to about 80 a month. As recently as the spring of 1944, residents of Honolulu were accustomed to seeing in their newspapers such headlines as, "Five Charged With Absenteeism Jailed by Lieutenant Colonel Newkirk," or "Three Fined \$100," or stories to the effect that "having failed to work regularly and faithfully" an employee had been given 1 month in jail. In addition to these military controls, the Honolulu police "vag squad" was permitted to assist in enforcement of labor orders by certain techniques all its own.

Despite these strenuous methods, it is the opinion of persons acquainted with the islands that labor outside the military jurisdiction had a better record on absenteeism than the labor force subject to military control.

The sugar and pineapple industries have had their own labor problems. War work drained many of their employees away, and the number of employees in the sugar fields declined. The Big Five met the situation by striking a bargain under which the plantation workers would be loaned to the military establishments from time to time, particularly in off seasons, with the plantation owners continuing to pay their wages and furnish living quarters and supplies. The owners were reimbursed by the military for these expenditures, and whether the plantation owners had profited unduly by this method of selling the service of their employees is not yet clear.

On March 10, 1943, by joint proclamations of the commanding general and the Governor, certain jurisdiction over labor matters was relinquished to the civil government. The method of division chosen, based on the degree of military interest in the particular establishment, had the effect of splitting Territorial labor through the middle, giving divided control and keeping employees in particular industries separated. The military handled the employee complaints by doing little or nothing about them. Hawaiian labor, fearful of public opinion because of labor's multiracial composition and keenly conscious of the importance of the work in which it was engaged, felt bound not to strike by the no-strike pledge, and therefore had no recourse.

Principal complaints were against the Hawaiian Electric Co. and the Honolulu Transit Co. The Hawaiian unions have complained frequently concerning alleged violence done their organizers by military officials. Three major AFL unions issued a memorandum in the spring of 1944, alleging that on the island of Kauai the lieutenant colonel in charge caused the arrest of the union head of the long-shoremen's local, and held him for 6 months. He was subsequently released under longshoremen's pressure, but meanwhile the union was crushed. It also was asserted that the military forbade the collection of dues for 10 months among cannery workers on the island, resulting in the death of the union. On another

island a civilian employee of military intelligence allegedly successfully dissuaded a number of sugar workers from joining a union. This employee was subsequently discharged by the Army but the local military intelligence officer, brother of the plantation manager, issued a statement praising his work. The most recent incident of this type was a report in the Honolulu press in March 1944, of a complaint by the CIO that when five of its organizers visited one of the smaller islands they were forcibly expelled by the major installed as provost marshal and told to report to their local draft boards.

The biggest labor case decided by the labor control board is known as the Tuna Packers decisions, decided in January 1944. This case involved a controversy between the marine engineers and drydock workers and the Hawaiian Tuna Packers, which does Navy repair work. Issues were maintenance of membership, voluntary check-off, a labor management of membership voluntary check-off, a labor-management committee, and wages. The military governor referred the case to the labor control board. The military governor at first refused to allow the union to be represented by its regular leaders, insisting on company employees, but he later reversed himself. The panel, without regard to the practices of the National War Labor Board, held that the military governor had complete jurisdiction over labor disputes whether or not they were submitted for arbitration. It rejected maintenance of membership as "incompatible with the war program." It declared that the check-off would be illegal. The panel rejected the labor-management committee, saying that management had the basic responsibility for the war program which "can neither be divided between a company and a union, nor can it be abridged by reason of existence of a management-labor committee or by anything else."

Honolulu newspaper reports for January 28 contained the reactions to the opinion. The general manager of Tuna Packers said: "In all important aspect, the company's position has been sustained and the demands of the union rejected. We are pleased that the controversy had been settled * * *." The union said: "In spite of this raw deal, the members of our union at Hawaiian Tuna Packers will continue their all-out war production, though their morale must be severely tried. They know that this war must be won at the earliest possible moment so that democracy can be reestablished throughout the world."

It is not difficult to understand why the desire to retain the labor control is said to be the chief reason for the existence and the continuance of martial law and why spokesmen for the Big Five have endorsed it. On December 27, 1942, the Honolulu Chamber of Commerce, in telegrams to the President and other Government officials, expressed its satisfaction with martial law. The Honolulu Advertiser had expressed a similar view.—From Columbia Law Review, September 1944.

HAWAII—DEMOCRACY OF THE PACIFIC

"In the Territory of Hawaii, the people work, eat, drink, and sleep Big Five, for little matter to what phase of island life you turn, it is somehow connected with the Big Five monopoly."

THE BIG FIVE

Who are the Big Five?

According to Mr. Jared Smith, financial editor of one of Hawaii's controlled newspapers, in his booklet, he referred to Hawaii's five largest companies as the Big Five. These are Castle & Cooke, Alexander & Baldwin, Theo. H. Davies, C. Brewer & Co., and American Factors.

What are the Big Five?

The management of these giant companies direct the economic destiny of Hawaii. They are, primarily, agents for the Territory's pineapple and sugar crops, the Nos. 1 and 2 industries of Hawaii. As this booklet unravels itself, it will show their partial ownership and complete control of most lucrative interests in the islands.

How did it start?

The forefathers of the Big Five were missionaries that came to Hawaii over a century ago to Christianize the natives. They knew a "good thing" when they saw it. The opportunity for worldly gain was so great that many of them gave up their missionary affiliations and devoted themselves to the idea of worldly gain. Much ownership and control of the Big Five today is held by the heirs of this missionary stock.

When did it start?

This feudalistic monopoly has been in existence for the last century. This took place when the missionaries decided to give up the church and become businessmen.

Where?

This Big Five domination extends itself all over the Hawaiian Islands. The monopoly is quite complete, reaching out to the islands like the tentacles of an octopus.

THE BIG FIVE AND THE REPUBLICAN PARTY IN HAWAII

The Republican Party in Hawaii and the Big Five are symbolical of each other. They go hand in hand. This is the reason that about 95 percent of the Territory's Delegates to Congress, Territorial legislators, county officials, and Territorial appointive officials were steadfast Republicans. There were and are very few independent people in Hawaii who could financially, or otherwise, give opposition to the Republican big interests. Democrats were very seldom heard of. The big interest philosophy seemed to be, "Might is right."

The Republican Party in Hawaii is nothing more than a tool of the Big Five manipulated to do its bidding. The Republican Party represents the vested interests in Hawaii's Territorial Legislature. Not that I think that big business shouldn't be represented, but senators and representatives are elected by the people and are elected to represent the people. The great business interests of Hawaii should be given consideration in the legislature, but they should not try to monopolize and control its functions—that of serving the people.

The Republican Party is a party of the plantations, by the plantations, and for the plantations. Throughout Hawaii's Republican sugar plantations and pineapple industry the people are intimidated into voting a full Republican ticket—or else. The people are told how to vote in no uncertain terms. The tale of intimidation of the workers of these industries is long and sordid. A spirit of independence is frowned upon. Even on the outside of the plantations—in Hawaii's other industries, there are few people indeed that cannot be pressured in one way or another.

There are many fine liberal Republicans in Hawaii among the people, and they are independent in mind although many of them cannot express themselves freely for fear of reaction. These liberal Republicans are interested in a good clean government and a fine American community in which to live.

They, too, hate autocracy.

An old-timer of Hawaii made the following statement and it rings true: "To get ahead in Hawaii, a person must join the Central Union Church and the Republican Party." His success would be assured. Isn't that the truth, though.

SO YOU DON'T BELIEVE THAT BIG FIVE CONTROL EXISTS IN HAWAII

Well, then, who owns or controls the following in Hawaii?

The sugar industry	Press and radio stations
The pineapple industry	Hawaii's finest buildings
Majority of land areas	Tourist trade
Majority of water rights	Lumber and building materials
Almost 100 percent of the banking business	Large percentage of—
Trust companies	Cattle ranches
Shipping	Utility companies
Majority of wholesale and retail food and mercantile stores	Republican Party
The big theatrical chain	Territorial government
The large estates	Educational system
	And everything, literally speaking, worth anything

The answer is: The Big Five.

It is accomplished by a very practical network:

1. Actual ownership.
2. Interlocking directorates.
3. Banking system.
4. Inter-marriage of kamaaina families.
5. Interisland business associates dependent upon the Big Five.

So, little matter what you do or touch, in Hawaii, it is in some way connected with this monopoly, for the system is extremely complete.

ISLAND OF LANAI

The island of Lanai is owned by the Hawaiian Pineapple Co. This island was purchased for approximately \$1,000,000. The island is used exclusively for the production of pineapples, whereby it derives the name "the Pineapple Island." Some livestock is raised. A person must have the permission of the pine management before setting foot on the island. The Hawaiian Pineapple Co. is partly owned and fully controlled by the Big Five.

ISLAND OF NIIHAU

The island of Niihau is owned in its entirety by the Robinson family, of Kauai. The island was supposedly purchased for around \$10,000. Very few have ever been allowed to set foot on the island. More about the island later in this booklet in a news story which appeared in the Hawaii Sentinel some time ago.

ISLAND OF MOLOKAI

The community life of the "friendly Isle of Molokai" is centered around George P. Cooke. Cooke's Molokai ranch takes up some 70,000 acres. Mr. Cooke is the self-appointed king of Molokai. The other industries of the island are the California Packing Corporation and Libby McNeill & Libby, both large pineapple companies.

The Hawaiian Homesteaders are trying, very discouragingly, to keep their homesteads with so little water that it's pitiful. However, Mr. Cooke seems to have water when the peoples' tongues are hanging out and their fields scorched.

The Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, an act to rehabilitate the Hawaiian people, should be repealed for it has been a farce as far as rehabilitating the Hawaiian people. The act provides land with no water. Many think that there is an effort being made to discourage the Hawaiian people so that they will leave their homestead lands. Naturally, big business is there, Johnny on the spot, to grab it—a new act should be enacted embodying a section for the development of water on Homes Commission land.

There are a few independent small ranches, farms, and businesses.

Mr. George P. Cooke is an affiliate of the Big Five.

ISLAND OF KAUAI

On the island of Kauai, the commercial life of the island is built around the sugar and pineapple industries, and subsidiary Big Five companies.

The people of the island must either work for the sugar plantations, the pineapple plantations, or subsidiary Big Five companies. The only other means of livelihood is independent farming and homesteading and small businesses. A few hold county government positions. The commercial centers are small plantation towns and the Lihue Plantation Co. is very reluctant to sell business sites in Lihue, the county seat of Kauai. Home sites are almost unobtainable. Kauai is a tight little kingdom of sugar and pineapple interests.

ISLAND OF MAUI

The island of Maui is controlled commercially by the Baldwin clan. The people of Maui have grown weary of such tight-fisted control, not only of commerce but the control and intimidation of themselves. The Democrats swept Maui last election, breaking the Republican hold on the island of 40 years' standing. The Baldwins and their colleagues are still dumbfounded as to how such a catastrophe could have taken place. Funny thing, too, Chu Baldwin, son of F. F. Baldwin, who was a senatorial candidate on the Republican ticket, got a resounding dumping in the last election.

The people were tired of rule by intimidation—they wanted a change and they made a change.

The Baldwins partly own and control the two large sugar companies (Hawaiian Commercial & Sugar Co. and Maui Agricultural Co.), the two large pineapple companies (Maui Pine and Baldwin Packers), the two largest wholesale food and merchandise outlets (Paia Store and Kahului Store), to say nothing of the transport facilities—Kahului Railroad, bus fleet, and trucking system. Also cattle ranches, dairies, the largest retail outlets, control of water rights, great land areas, and the press. Most of the individual merchants on Maui must depend on the Baldwin wholesale stores for merchandise.

The only commodity not controlled is the people's vote (because of the secret ballot).

The Baldwins are a part of the Big Five. Other than the Baldwin plantations, there are the Wailuku Sugar Co., owned by C. Brewer Co., and the Pioneer Mill Co., which is owned by American Factors. Both are a segment of the sugar monopoly.

The people of Maui must buy their water from the plantations. They must also purchase their electrical current from the plantations. Land for home sites is almost impossible to purchase and a person couldn't buy a business site in the seaport town of Kihului under any circumstances. Kihului, Maui, boasts of being one of the world's most secure monarchies, in absolute domination by the "autocratic King of Kihului."

In other words, in the little kingdom of Maui, the people eat, work, drink, and sleep Baldwin.

They call this democracy.

THE "BIG ISLAND OF HAWAII"

This island is little different from the rest. The Big Five reigns supreme and sugar is the staple of the island. There are a few huge cattle ranches and a sprinkling of lesser ones. A great deal of diversified agriculture is raised by independent farmers (who were formed into cooperatives immediately after the beginning of the war, and the main force behind the organization are the president and the treasurer, both sugar men). It doesn't seem logical that a person or present-day business would have their business or investment managed by a group whose predominating interest or monetary regard are aside from the business they actually represent. Most of the farmers are of Japanese ancestry and due to the war, it is said that pressure was brought to bear to influence and increase membership under the guise of patriotism and economic sanctions. Now that this cooperative is a going concern, why hasn't it been turned over to the farmer producers? The commercial life of the island of Hawaii is naturally built around the Big Five.

BIG FIVE PINEAPPLE COMPANIES

The following five (of Hawaii's seven) pineapple companies are under Big Five control: Hawaiian Pineapple Co.—Islands of Oahu and Lanai. The Baldwin Packers and the Maui Pineapple Co.—Island of Maui. The Kauai Pineapple Co. and the Hawaiian Canneries—Island of Kauai.

BIG FIVE BANKING BUSINESS

Hawaii's huge banking interests are greatly owned and controlled by the Big Five. These are, namely, the Bank of Bishop and the Bank of Hawaii. The majority of the Territory's banking transactions are through these two firms.

BIG FIVE BUILT THE FINEST BUILDINGS

The most finely constructed and most impressive buildings in Hawaii are those of the Big Five. They are within shadow's distance of each other in the center of Honolulu's better business district. These are the Castle & Cooke Building, Alexander & Baldwin Building, Theo. H. Davies, American Factors, C. Brewer & Co. Then there are the Big Five Bank & Trust Co. building and hotels, the Dillingham Building, etc.

INSURANCE BUSINESS

By partially owning and controlling the most lucrative industries in Hawaii, the Big Five also control a majority of the insurance business.

INTERISLAND TRAVEL

' The Big Five controls the interisland shipping in Hawaii. Inter-Island Steam and Navigation Co., and Hawaiian Airlines (passenger service and air-freight).

MAINLAND TO HAWAII TRAVEL AND FREIGHT SERVICE

Only one shipping company has control of all shipping between Hawaii and the mainland. This is the Matson Navigation Co., largely owned and completely controlled by the Big Five.

When the Dollar Line started calling at Hawaii's ports, the Matson Co. put two ships into trans-Pacific service and, by undercutting rates, brought the Dollar Line to her knees. The Dollar Line agreed that it would charge Matson rates on passenger and freight service if Matson would stay out of the Orient. Dollar agreed also to kick-back to Matson, 50 cents out of every dollar's worth of business that Dollar carried on between the Hawaii-mainland run. Matson was getting rich off of her own business and also that of the Dollar Line. This is the way Matson, a Big Five offspring, killed the competition in the shipping business.

BIG FIVE ATTEMPT TO CONTROL ISLE PRODUCE

The sugar and pineapple crops take up over 95 percent of Hawaii's cultivated land. More island grown produce means less land for the No. 1 and No. 2 crops. Many attempts have been made to discourage Hawaii's produce farmers. Less vegetables were grown in the year after Pearl Harbor, than before, although the Government spent close to \$100,000 to stimulate the growing of produce.

Being that 85 percent of all food is shipped into the Territory, Matson would lose many fat cargoes if Hawaii was made self-supporting in food.

LUMBER CONTROL AFFILIATED WITH THE BIG FIVE

Why is it in normal times that a house in Hawaii that cost \$6,000 to build, costs only about half that sum in California? Not only do the Big Five tack on a juicy shipping charge to the building materials but the mark-up of mainland lumber in Hawaii is terrific. Several independent dealers in lumber have tried to get a foothold on the lumber business in Hawaii but have always run right up against a blank wall. Remember, Matson has the monopoly on shipping to Hawaii. Lumber must be brought in on ships.

CHARGE EXORBITANT PRICES TO GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES

Certain of the big companies have charged governmental agencies much more for certain commodities than they could be purchased for from independent dealers.

Big Five 2½ percent rake-off on agency system is enormous.

This 2½ percent agency charge on the plantations is based on the gross and not the net income. Therefore a stockholder's loss is a Big Five gain. The agencies milk the plantations by charging high costs for fertilizer, machinery, equipment, hauling, etc. The big interests get more and the shareholder less.

HAWAII'S SUGAR-COATED LEGISLATURE

When Hawaii's Territorial Legislature is in session, there is such a swarm of Big Five attorneys around that a person would think it was a sugar and pineapple convention rather than a body elected to legislate for the people. These lawyers are there at the crack of dawn and the last to leave. Every committee room is covered. On any issue that affects the Big Five, one attorney has a cinch of 16 votes in his pocket. House votes. One attorney, representing the HSPA and the chamber of commerce, presents the house members and senators with the analysis of every bill introduced in the legislature. That way, a member doesn't have to exert his brain power. Nothing like helping the legislators to think along HSPA and Big Five lines.

BIG FIVE COMPANIES ARE AGENTS FOR SUGAR PLANTATIONS

The following five companies are agents for all the sugar plantations in Hawaii: American Factors, Alexander & Baldwin, C. Brewer & Co., Theo. H. Davies, Castle & Cooke.

These Big Five companies hold the complete control of Hawaii's lucrative sugar industry. Uncle Sam subsidizes the sugar industry almost \$20,000,000 yearly.

The Big Five largely own and control the world's finest sugar refinery at Crockett, Calif. The presidents of these agencies are trustees of the Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association.

The Big Five are buying and selling agents for all of Hawaii's sugar plantations. For these services the Big Five receive $2\frac{1}{2}$ percent from the gross profits from the sale of sugar from the particular plantations that each acts as agent for.

In prewar years, the No. 1 and No. 2 crops were responsible for from 85 to 90 percent of Hawaii's production and benefits.

The largest income of the Big Five is not from the agency fees but from dividends declared by the plantations. Each corporate agent owns a substantial but not always the controlling interest in many plantations. The greater the revenue of the plantations, the larger the profits for the Big Five. Officers of the plantation companies are also Big Five officers.

Because of the close relationship between the agent and the plantation, the following statement that "the Big Five are forever taking money out of one pocket and putting it back in the other" rings true.

Not only does the Big Five hold large blocks of stock in the plantations but the plantations hold substantial blocks of Big Five stock.

CONTROLLED COUNTY GOVERNMENT

The county governments in the past have been totally controlled by the plantation managers and owners on the outside islands. The members of the boards of supervisors had little expression of their own. They were usually employees or were affiliated with the industry in some manner and any private expression by them, in opposition of any kind would end in dismissal. Most of the past county supervisors and county officers were of the Republican Party.

This was a very unhealthy condition in an American community, for this helped to pull the noose more tightly around the poor people who were dependent on the plantations for a living. They lived a life of intimidation—no wonder that the people could give little opposition to this oppression.

There has always been pressure from the big interests to keep the county workers' wages at a low figure so that the people on the plantations would not get dissatisfied and leave the plantations for other employment.

HSPA SAYS, "LET'S BE FRIENDS"

It's so serious that it's laughable. The working man in Hawaii has been the underdog to the feudal capitalistic sugar autocrats for the last century.

History proves, that not only monetarily but by every other conceivable method, that the laboring man was driven to do the ill wishes of his tyrannical master. Many of the men were driven out into the fields with black-snake whips and, if you demand the proof, I refer you to some of Hawaii's older plantation workers of today.

But this is what's so funny. Now that labor is united in the Territory and can fight for themselves and demand recognition for collective bargaining at the same round table with management and industry, the Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association (sugar company union) says, "Let's be friends." Just imagine, after the last hundred years of blood, sweat, and tears on the part of the little man, when he finally gets big enough to fight for himself (collectively speaking), the Republican autocratic sugar barons want to let bygones be bygones.

The laboring class of the Territory will never forget.

A BEVY OF BIG FIVE LAWYERS

It would surprise you to learn the number of Big Five lawyers in Hawaii and the fees they receive. These lawyers represent not only the autocrats themselves but they represent the Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association, the Hawaii Employers Council, the Pineapple Producers Association, and any other form of business that the Big Five are interested in.

The pet satisfaction of any one of these big interest lawyers is to think that he has found a new way to beat the people's labor movement in Hawaii. Nothing pleases him more, for he knows that there is a fat reward for his efforts.

HAWAIIAN SUGAR PLANTERS' ASSOCIATION AND THE HAWAII EMPLOYERS' COUNCIL

The Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association is a union representing the combined sugar industry of the Territory. This association sets the policies and the direc-

tion by which the other associations in Hawaii are ruled by. On Maui, it's the Maui Planters' Association. On Kauai, it's the Kauai Planters' Association. On Hawaii, it's the Big Island Planters' Association. So I should say that the sugar interests are pretty well taken care of. Our only contention is that if the unions are good for capital and management, then why can't they be just as beneficial to labor?

You don't hear the adverse criticism of labor toward the HSPA that you hear from the Hawaiian Sugar Planters Association and the Hawaii Employers' Council against the poor laboring man's union.

The Hawaii Employers' Council is an organization set up by the Big Five interests in the Territory of Hawaii as their bargaining agent with labor. Mr. James P. Blaisdell is the council's president and was brought to Hawaii from the mainland and is paid a fabulous salary of \$25,000 to think up the ways and means whereby the island capitalists can be protected from the little man's labor movement. Mr. James P. Blaisdell must be "God's gift to the sugar planters, etc.," to be worth so much money.

If the plantations had spent as much money for the benefit of the workingman as they have spent to defeat him, the labor movement would have had an extremely hard time getting started in Hawaii.

These are the four guiding principles of the Hawaii Employers' Council:

1. Stable, peaceful, and harmonious relations between employers and employees;

2. Wages and working conditions fair both to employer and employee;

3. Honest and faithful observance of all agreements by all parties concerned;

4. Recognition that the public interest always is paramount.

Blaisdell made this statement. "These declarations mean just what they say. We shall live up to them and we shall insist that labor meets us on the same fair ground. That is the foundation on which industrial peace can be built in Hawaii."

That statement is laughable and for the following reason: labor in Hawaii has never been in any position to live up to anything for they have always been the underdog to management.

There is only one explanation to it. Now that labor has grown big enough to fight its own battles, industry says, "We don't want to fight, but if you'll turn your head the other way a moment, we'll use a pair of brass knuckles on you."

HAWAII'S DELEGATE HAS NO VOTE IN CONGRESS

The Honorable Joseph R. Farrington, Hawaii's Delegate to Congress of the United States, sits in Congress with no vote, although he can introduce bills and sit on committees.

Joe Farrington, personally is a very fine person, but he, like the Delegates before him, is very close to the Big Five. Delegate Farrington, as part owner of the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, is closely allied with the big interests of the Territory.

Many people have wondered who is representing Hawaii in Congress—our Delegate or the representatives of the Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association. If it is the latter, you may be sure that their interests come first and the people's last.

The people of Hawaii are wondering why the Honorable Joseph R. Farrington doesn't introduce legislation concerning the great land holding monopolies in Hawaii.

IT'S THE PARADISE OF THE PACIFIC—FOR THE BIG FIVE

Tourist trade in prewar years

The tourist trade, in prewar years was Hawaii's third largest industry. And like everything else that is lucrative, the big interests got their share of the business and it was always the largest share.

The tourists were brought to Hawaii on Matson boats (Castle & Cooke). They boarded and roomed at the swank Royal Hawaiian Hotel, The Moana Hotel and Kona Inn—all Big Five hostleries. The tourist transportation between islands was by Inter-Island steamers and Hawaiian Airlines planes.

The paradise-seeking tourists were sunned on the two or three hundred yards of sand that make up the Waikiki beach area. What a laugh. They were shown through Hawaiian Pineapple Co. and given all the pineapple juice they could hold. Hula shows and luaus were conducted for the malihinis. They were bedecked with leis and shown the pineapple and sugarcane fields from Aloha Tower.

The tourists were met at the docks by the Royal Hawaiian Band. Gaiety and festivity was the rule. Tours were conducted to show off Hawaii's gorgeous natural wonders and panoramas. They were bid good-bye with the Aloha of the islands. They thought they had been to heaven and back.

Hawaii's Legislature even appropriated the people's money for the tourist bureau.

Did the big interests that were enjoying all the tourist business tell the tourist—

About the cheap wages that the plantation laborer received.

About the low standard of living on Hawaii's plantations.

About the shacks that were furnished for living quarters.

About the unsanitary plumbing conditions on the plantations.

About the feudalistic serfdom of the plantations.

About the social conditions on the plantations.

Yet, the cost of living was on the same level as that of the mainland. A bag of rice or a bag of flour cost a laborer just as much as a plantation manager.

This was Aloha land.

HAWAII'S CONTROLLED PRESS

The press is controlled. How? A newspaper thrives on the advertising it receives. The Big Five companies control most of the lucrative advertising. Not only the juicy share of their own, but also their subsidiary companies and the majority of all retail business (even the independent businesses that must depend on Big Five wholesalers for merchandise so they can be pressured). Not only is the press controlled through advertising * * * the real control is by direct ownership and interlocking directorships with the Big Five machine.

If big business wants something in the press—it's printed. If they desire to use the press for a smear campaign—they attack. If they, on the other hand, want to cover up certain situations—the copy is kept out of the paper.

It is no wonder that the Big Five can formulate public opinion, for they have no opposition.

The radio stations are controlled in a like manner.

It is interesting to note the directors of the press and radio in Hawaii.

FORWARD FOR HAWAII

[From the Hawaii Sentinel, May 27, 1937]

Until the Sentinel was born the masses of Hawaii were voiceless. Business in Hawaii was in the grip of a few men of cold blood and greed. Labor was in chains. Government was the pawn and creature of a masterful gang.

Today Hawaii stands at the opening of a new era. The public has a forum in print. The independent merchant has someone to defend his rights, to strike for freedom from exactions of arbitrary power entrenched. Labor has been freed of the terror and dares hold up its head.

Those steps for progress have all been taken since the Sentinel, armed with freedom and the truth, stepped into the arena to fight the battles of humanity.

No longer do the men of might give orders to their lackeys to betray and flout the people's welfare without hesitation. No longer do the lackeys obey, in all things from legislation to murder, without looking over their shoulders. No longer are the masses of Hawaii's people kept silent under whip and menace. For the Sentinel is serving them, guarding their weal, fighting for better things here for all.

This is the purpose, the work of the Sentinel. While the venal press, so long obedient to wrong, so long subservient to privilege, falters on its way, the Sentinel strides ahead proud of its mission and purposes, proud of its service in behalf of a better Hawaii and a freer, more prosperous America. Pressing forward in the fight, the Sentinel calls on all who read to unite with it in the war of right against might.

[From the Hawaii Sentinel]

WASHINGTON UNMASKS HAWAII'S VENAL PRESS—LOCAL DAILY NAMES

Hawaii's corrupt daily press has been indicted in the Congressional Record and by silence has pleaded guilty to the charge.

Their press bureaus at Washington have been shown up as lying propaganda mills.

"Downright, deliberate lie" is the term used to define one vital piece of "news" printed here as out of the "Star-Bulletin Bureau" at Washington.

In the next sentence Samuel Wilder King, Delegate from Hawaii, is denounced as a fake hero of false news deliberately put up to make him appear to voters here a virile debater and defender of island welfare.

All these facts have been hidden from the public by the daily newspapers of Hawaii, even the authentic official news at Washington being thus corrupted for private ends.

By printing fake news the Hawaii daily press has brought down on Hawaii more damning publicity, done more injury to island interests, than can be overcome in years.

The injury has been done, too, where it will do the most harm—right on the floor of Congress.

It brought about the pillorying of Delegate King as a subservient tool of sugar by a Member of Congress in a public speech—gave warning of his real status to every Senator and Representative.

It set all Washington in a frame of mind to give Hawaii nothing, to examine with a microscope everything it asks.

Among other things, this press fakery ended for years any hope Hawaii might have had for statehood.

Exposure of press corruption here was made by Hon. Frank E. Hook, of Michigan, as shown in the Congressional Record of May 28.

The Star-Bulletin fake was printed April 30 on a "well-received" speech supposed to have been made by King in the House, painting King as joining in spirited debate with Hook. The Record proves the whole thing 100 percent faked.

Hook's statement:

"This lie was probably motivated by the connection of the Delegate from Hawaii with the Hawaiian Big Five, Republican controlled, and whose capital owns the sugar industry, shipping, light and power, gas company, telephone company, newspapers, traction company, banks and loan companies, and all other utilities, including tourist hotels; also the courts, to say nothing of the legislature, FERA, and WPA funds.

"This (fake news) was not only a deliberate lie, and I charge the Delegate from Hawaii with deliberate manipulation of such misinformation. The tactics by the Delegate from Hawaii are the tactics that have been used by the Big Five of Hawaii—un-American, unprincipled."

It was the printed lie that stirred Representative Hook to demand congressional investigation of Hawaii "both from the angle of violation of the Corrupt Practices Act and from the labor and immigration conditions that exist in the Territory."

The lie caused Hook also to read into the Congressional Record a letter sent him May 18 bringing the Japanese issue in Hawaii to national notice.

"Let us see," Hook urged, "why the Delegate from Hawaii might be so interested in this sugar situation. Let us go back to the benefit payments under the Jones-Costigan Act and see what this Big Five received. They benefited immensely, because the benefits paid were \$3,700,000, and there were only 39 contracts, and the smallest benefit payment received in Hawaii was a little over \$4,000, the largest a little over \$1,000,000."

In the Congressional Record:

"The Big Five are Republicans, and I am wondering how much was dumped into the coffers of the last campaign, where no record has been made of such contributions. It would probably be a subject of investigation by this Congress. Probably that accounted for the statement made on the floor of the House by the Delegate from Hawaii that his opponent received a lot of applause but did not receive the votes. I have heard of organizations manipulating votes through contributions before."

Large space is taken in various issues of the Congressional Record to print the comment aroused by the Star-Bulletin's faked "news," all of it injurious to Hawaii's best interests. Local effort to suppress the facts by hiding available copies of the Record have failed.

Neither Delegate King nor the Star-Bulletin has ventured denial or reply to Representative Hook's indictment of them. All news of the astounding exposure at Washington has been suppressed, too, in every newspaper in Hawaii except the Sentinel.

[From the Sentinel, August 1, 1940]

AD AGENCY PLENTY MAD OVER FORTUNE MAGAZINE ARTICLE; WANT TO CANCEL
TOURIST ADS

Publication of a slightly flippant and in places potent vinegar article about Hawaii in Fortune magazine for August has made the handlers of Hawaii's puff publicity, Bowman, Deute, Cummings Co., madder than a wet hen.

Yes, so mad that they want to cancel the nice, fat advertising contract they handed to Fortune magazine, totaling over \$5,000 for three full-page black and white bleed advertisements, which they intended should run in the January and April issues of 1941.

And to show Fortune officials that they appreciate a paper that holds its policies to reactionary business, they want to up the ante over \$500, and place these same ads in Nation's Business.

To bring this cancellation about the San Francisco officials of the company sent a letter to the officials of the local tourist bureau, practically mandating them to get behind this cancellation move.

The letter sent to the local members of the tourist bureau indicates how the puff bureau boys feel, but they failed to explain just how they slipped up in letting this article get into print, after placing that five grand ad contract with the magazine.

The letter signed by an official of the advertising company in no uncertain words states that the article "represents an unfriendly, damaging attack upon the Territory as a whole, the character of its people and industries."

And in the same letter, is given the tip-off how this firm places the Hawaii puff publicity. The writer declares: "Particularly should it be recorded that the original version of the manuscript was submitted to our office for review and suggestions; that thereupon we promptly pointed out by lengthy telegrams and personal representation through our New York office, that in all the welter of wordage one phenomenon stood forth; the editors were not taking recourse to facts but were rather engaging in unmistakably biased, harmful innuendos and distorted conclusions."

Continuing he added: "Although the editors did observe some representations, in the main, the general tenor and destructive import of the scurrilous article remains unchanged."

Further the letter charged that the article is full of artful, harmful references to tourism, the sugar industry, many of Hawaii's principal business organizations and executives, and a broad indictment of its people, their motives, even their patriotism.

It is also announced in this letter that Matson Steamship Co. has decided to cancel its advertising contract with Fortune magazine.

One of the highlights of the article is the crack at Harold Lord Varney, one of the supposed best puff men of the Pan-Pacific Press Bureau. He is named as a leading light, one-time editor of the fascistic Awakener in New York.

Also it charges that visitations of mainland writers are managed. It also reveals how the dispatches of Lorrin Thurston, written about the beet-sugar industry on the mainland, during his visit there recently, before they appeared in his own paper were edited by the Pan-Pacific press puff bureau, controlled by the oligarchy.

The article charges also that the rulers of Hawaii take the attitude that labor unions are works of the devil. To back up some of these deductions the Pratt NLRB report is quoted, but somebody failed to impress on the writer, when he was here that this was written in 1937.

The article raises the question also of the shinto loyalty of the dual citizen in Hawaii. It declares: "The younger Japanese may be United States citizens by right of birth on American soil, but their race, law, and religion presumably bind many of them to Hirohito. The civilian devices for regimenting the Japanese may be first rate, but the Army and Navy are not counting on them for M-day. On that dread day the Army will have concentration camps—and it keeps a grab list of suspicious citizens up to date. * * * And the Army and Navy may well think that a benevolent feudalism supported at the base by potential spies and saboteurs is worse from a military standpoint than no feudalism at all."

Many other subjects are covered in the article just as caustically. Indications are now that Fortune magazine or any of its correspondents in the future will get the cold eye and bum's rush if they should show up in Hawaii.

What action on the ad cancellation will be taken could not be determined up to press time of the Sentinel.

[From the Sentinel, August 18, 1938]

RADIO SPEECH OF ROOSEVELT IS SABOTAGED

Leaders of the Republican Party, who indirectly control the radio stations in Hawaii, do not intend to allow even the voice of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, to interfere with their plans of a GOP victory this election in Hawaii.

This became evident this week when the radio talk of President Roosevelt sent out over the Nation and broadcast from coast to coast, failed to be rebroadcast in Hawaii.

It seems somebody in Hawaii since the broadcast at Aala Park, by labor protesting the Hilo shooting, has found that the law permits the radio station owners to bar from the air anything which they, in their opinion, could be classed as a controversial subject. This was the excuse used to cancel the time contracted and paid for by Edward Berman, CIO leader, who wished to answer some of the charges made against workers by Sheriff Henry Martin and the executive secretary of the Hilo Chamber of Commerce, Gordon H. Scruton.

It was learned from a prominent Democrat that he made a personal visit to one of the local stations and offered to pay the cost of the President's rebroadcast. He declared he was met with a stony indifference and the statement that they did not think the rebroadcast was of sufficient public interest to be put on. On insisting that he differed with the manager of the station, he declared he left believing that the President's talk would be put on the air.

The reason understood to be for failure to rebroadcast is the belief that the President might use his publicized talk on social security as a means of rousing the rabble further against the economic royalists of America. It is well known that Hawaii economic royalists are hypersensitive to his caustic criticism. Another belief is said to be that the President expected to use the broadcast to put over some more of his "purge" propaganda, aimed at the Democratic Tories now up for election.

Such beliefs are declared to have served as the excuse for preventing the people of Hawaii from hearing directly the message of the President. The only reports of the speech available to the public were the skeletonized, garbled press dispatches, subject to censorship in the editorial rooms of the local daily papers.

Protest against both the denial of the air to Berman, after the opponents of organized labor had been given their say and of the failure to rebroadcast the President's speech after it had been requested and payment for the time offered, have been filed with the Federal Radio Commission in Washington. A ruling as to such acts will be asked of the Commission to prevent silencing of those opposed to the powers that be in the coming election, under the guise of refusing use of the station for "controversial subjects."

[From the Sentinel, August 29, 1940]

INTERLOCKING DIRECTORATE SET-UP HERE DUE FOR HOT WASHINGTON BLAST

Another cloud that spells trouble for the Hawaii oligarchy is heading this way, it was learned, and it is getting its impetus from Washington.

Word reached here this week for the local boys to get their interlocking director set-up scrambled or in legal order, and be prepared to weather a typhonic storm, which even their prayers this time will not turn from its path.

It was learned from a reliable source that Senator Pat Harrison's Mississippi sugar committee is determined to do some real gunning against Hawaii in its hearings slated for an early session.

Harrison, it was learned, is expected to hit Hawaii in its vulnerable spot, which is its factory oligarchic control of the sugar industry in Hawaii. He is also declared to be ready to push to the highest publicity point the fact that where the southern cane industry is made up wholly of real American workers, the Hawaii

industry although employing alien and hyphenated oriental-American workers is getting the same if not better breaks from the national administration.

Behind his move is declared to be the idea that since this is an election year, President Roosevelt will need badly a now divided Southern States vote wherever he can get it, while anything done to Hawaii's quota will have no effect on the national election, as Hawaii has no Presidential vote.

He is also expected to use the argument that any increased quota for the southern cane growers, would be more beneficial to the American mainland workers, than any help given the Hawaii cane producers, on the basis that Hawaii's profit spread goes to the oligarchic set-up, while the southern one will go to a large percentage of individual cane growers.

It was also learned that Senator Harrison will try to get into the record the interlocking tie-up between the Hawaii sugar producers, their agencies and the Matson Steamship Co., in an attempt to prove that what appears to be high cost of transporting Hawaii sugar to the mainland, is just a sleight of hand trick by the Hawaii oligarchy to make one pocket of the oligarchy empty while shifting their profit into another pocket of the oligarchy.

Also it was learned that Senator Harrison has been in touch with an informant in Hawaii, who is said to have sent him the series of self-indicting statements on interlocking control of industry in Hawaii, which were revealed in the recent fight to tighten that control by inaugurating a voting self-perpetuating trust agreement in the key companies of the oligarchy. This material is expected to give him some strong evidence to back up his contentions against Hawaii.

[Editorial from the Sentinel, February 25, 1937]

ECONOMIC POWER

The Sentinel's task is to guard Hawaii's interests and advance well-being and prosperity for its people. To do this duty it must study trends and policies, judge their results, and speak out to the public with the facts and their meanings.

In its constructive program the Sentinel finds the need of being critical of some interests, but has no personal animus in such criticism. Men who can act to make things better ought to do so, and if they do not they have no just cause to resent fact and fair opinion showing and discussing their failures.

We hold, for one thing, that Hawaii is being held back and endangered by too much economic power being in one small group. Economic power in the hands of a few persons gives control which is a terrific force capable of use to harm or benefit a multiple of persons. It can affect whole districts, shift the currents of trade, bring ruin to one community and prosperity to another. It goes far beyond the right realm of private enterprise; becomes more nearly a social institution.

It is neither necessary nor wise to continue this set-up by which Hawaii is kept in clique control. It is bad for Hawaii and in the long run will prove bad for the men who have the power and like to display it. A late study showed some 30 men holding 116 out of 193 directorships in the 25 corporations dominating Hawaii's economics. To approve of that interlocking system is to favor and defend oligarchy and look with unconcern on an early end to all democracy.

NOTICE THE TIE-UP IN THE FOLLOWING CORPORATIONS

Jared Smith, in his booklet entitled the "Big 5," states that the following are 5 big companies in Hawaii:

AMERICAN FACTORS, CASTLE & COOKE, ALEXANDER & BALDWIN, C. BREWER & Co.,
THEO H. DAVIES

ALEXANDER & BALDWIN, LTD.

(Directors)

H. A. Baldwin
F. F. Baldwin
H. K. Castle
W. W. Chamberlain
J. P. Cooke

A. L. Dean
C. R. Hemenway
J. F. Morgan
S. S. Peck

J. W. Speyer
J. Waterhouse
J. T. Waterhouse
J. P. Winne

AMERICAN FACTORS, LTD.

(Board of directors)

F. C. Atherton	G. P. Wilcox	P. E. Spalding
J. P. Cooke	C. R. Hemenway	G. W. Sumner
W. F. Dillingham	F. W. Jamieson	H. A. Walker
H. P. Faye	S. M. Lowrey	

C. BREWER & CO., LTD.

(Directors)

E. F. Bishop	E. A. R. Ross	G. W. Fisher
J. D. Larsen	W. Jamieson	P. E. Spalding
A. Cooke	C. H. Cooke	Carter Galt

CASTLE & COOKE

(Directors)

Frank C. Atherton	S. N. Castle	J. F. Morgan
J. B. Atherton	A. S. Davies	W. Tenney
A. G. Budge	P. K. McLean	Henry A. White
H. K. L. Castle		

THEO H. DAVIES

(Directors)

T. C. Davies	E. H. Wodehouse	G. H. Angus
Sir George Davies	T. Guard	D. McCorriston
J. E. Russell	C. V. Bennett	A. S. Davis
A. G. Smith		

CONSOLIDATED AMUSEMENT CO., LTD.

(Directors)

E. H. W. Broadbent	G. G. Fuller	E. I. Parker
A. L. Castle	James Henderson	A. E. Steadman
Cyril F. Damon	F. W. Jamieson	F. G. Williams
A. S. Davis	W. H. McNery	J. Howard Worrall
Elmer R. Davis	P. K. McLean	

HAWAII CONSOLIDATED RY, CO., LTD.

(Directors)

A. J. Lafferty	F. W. Jamieson	John Waterhouse
Thos. Guard	H. A. Walker	E. H. Wodehouse
U. J. Rainalter	J. Howard Worrall	C. R. Hemenway

HAWAIIAN CANNERIES CO., LTD.

(Directors)

C. E. S. Burns	A. Horner	G. W. Sumner
H. P. Faye	S. M. Lowrey	H. A. Walker
J. L. Fleming	U. J. Rainalter	G. P. Wilcox
H. McK. Haserot		

THE HAWAIIAN ELECTRIC CO., LTD.

(Directors)

F. C. Atherton	C. R. Hemenway	P. E. Spalding
C. H. Cooke	L. A. Hicks	Alva E. Steadman
Gerald W. Fisher	H. M. Richards	R. E. White

HAWAIIAN PINEAPPLE CO., LTD.

(Directors)

F. C. Atherton	Alan S. Davis	Livingston Jenks
A. G. Budge	James D. Dole	W. H. McInerny
E. W. Carden	W. H. B. Fowler	Geo. S. Waterhouse
S. N. Castle	C. J. Henderson	Henry A. White
C. F. Damon	F. W. Jamieson	J. H. Worrall

HAWAIIAN SUMATRA PLANTATIONS

(Directors)

W. D. Baldwin	A. H. Rice	W. A. White
J. K. Clarke	H. W. Rice	G. P. Wilcox
C. F. Damon	Rolla K. Thomas	R. E. Woolley
J. L. Fleming	J. Waterhouse	

HOME INSURANCE CO. OF HAWAII, LTD.

(Directors)

Frank C. Atherton	J. S. McCandless	H. M. Richards
E. A. Berndt	Wm. H. McInerny	U. J. Rainalter
Ralph E. Clark	P. K. McLean	Wm. Bush
F. W. Jamieson		

HAWAIIAN AGRICULTURAL CO.

(Directors)

P. E. Spalding	W. Jamieson	Carter Galt
C. H. Cooke	E. A. R. Ross	T. A. Cooke
L. D. Larsen		

HAWAIIAN COMMERCIAL & SUGAR CO., LTD.

(Directors)

George I. Brown	J. P. Cooke	J. F. Morgan
F. F. Baldwin	C. R. Hemenway	J. Waterhouse
A. L. Castle		

HAWAIIAN SUGAR CO.

(Directors)

Geo. I. Brown	C. F. Damon	J. Waterhouse
W. W. Chamberlain	C. R. Hemenway	J. T. Waterhouse
J. P. Cooke	J. F. Morgan	

HONOKAA SUGAR CO.

(Directors)

A. L. Castle	M. B. Henshaw	F. A. Schaefer
G. E. Schaefer	E. H. Wodehouse	

HONOLULU SUGAR CO.

(Directors)

P. E. Spalding	E. A. R. Ross	W. Pullar
L. D. Larsen	A. Lewis, Jr.	T. A. Cooke
W. Jamieson		

HUTCHINSON SUGAR PLANTATION CO.

(Directors)

A. T. Dunbar	J. B. McCargar	John D. McKee
Starr Bruce	P. E. Spalding	Frank J. Belcher, Jr.
C. F. Jacobson		

KAHUKU PLANTATION CO.

(Directors)

J. P. Cooke
J. F. Morgan

George T. Coulter
J. Waterhouse

H. W. B. White
E. H. Wodehouse

KEKAHA SUGAR CO., LTD.

(Directors)

E. H. W. Broadbent
J. P. Cooke
H. P. Faye
G. W. Fisher

F. W. Jamieson
S. M. Lowery
G. W. Sumner

H. V. Von Holt
H. A. Walker
G. P. Wilcox

HONOLULU GAS CO., LTD.

(Directors)

A. L. Castle
M. B. Henshaw
J. K. Clarke
Dr. F. L. Putman

H. W. Boynton
A. N. Campbell
Carter Galt

Cyril F. Damon
Dr. Paul Withington
A. C. Young

HONOLULU RAPID TRANSIT CO., LTD.

(Directors: 1942)

A. L. Castle
S. N. Castle
C. F. Damon
G. N. Vorhees

H. G. Dillingham
W. F. Dillingham
A. E. Kirk
J. B. Mann

P. K. McLean
Rolla K. Thomas
A. E. Steadman

INTER-ISLAND STEAM NAVIGATION CO., LTD.

(Directors)

J. K. Clarke
J. P. Cooke
A. S. Davis
G. Fisher

C. R. Hemenway
S. C. Kennedy
A. Lewis, Jr.

P. K. McLean
J. E. Russell
G. P. Wilcox

MUTUAL TELEPHONE CO.

(Directors)

J. A. Balch, chairman of the board
Alvah A. Scott, president
A. E. Steadman, vice president

John Waterhouse, vice president
W. C. Avery, secretary treasurer

The above, together with C. H. Cooke, P. E. Spalding, H. M. Richards, U. J. Rainalter, H. G. Dillingham, and J. F. Morgan, constitute the board of directors.

OAHU RAILWAY & LAND CO.

(Directors)

W. F. Dillingham
W. F. Frear
H. G. Dillingham

A. W. Van Valkenburg
J. D. McInerny
W. W. Chamberlain

H. V. von Holt
C. F. Weeber
U. E. Wild

EWA PLANTATION CO.

(Directors)

F. C. Atherton
J. D. Bond
A. G. Budge
A. L. Castle

S. N. Castle
H. K. Castle
C. H. Cooke
A. S. Davis

J. S. McCandless
J. D. McInerny
P. K. McLean
H. M. Richards

THE KOLOA SUGAR CO.

(Directors)

H. P. Faye
F. W. Jamieson
E. A. Knudsen

S. M. Lowery
W. M. McInerny
P. E. Spalding

G. W. Sumner
H. A. Walker
G. P. Wilcox

MAUI AGRICULTURAL CO., LTD.

(Directors)

F. C. Atherton
A. F. Baldwin
H. A. Baldwin

J. W. Cameron
J. P. Cooke
C. R. Hemenway

J. F. Morgan
Wm. Pullar
J. Waterhouse

M'BRYDE SUGAR CO., LTD.

(Directors)

W. W. Chamberlain
J. P. Cooke
H. G. Dillingham

C. R. Hemenway
H. V. von Holt
J. F. Morgan

R. McB. Purvis
J. Waterhouse

OAHU SUGAR CO., LTD.

(Directors)

W. F. Dillingham
H. P. Faye
S. M. Lowery

J. S. McCandless
W. H. McInerny
G. W. Sumner

H. A. Walker
G. P. Wilcox
E. H. Wodehouse

OLAA SUGAR CO., LTD.

(Directors)

W. W. Chamberlain
W. F. Dillingham
H. P. Faye

R. K. Kimball
S. M. Lowrey
W. H. McInerny

G. W. Sumner
H. A. Walker
G. P. Wilcox

ONOMEA SUGAR CO.

(Directors)

E. A. R. Ross
Wm. Pullar
P. E. Spalding

W. Jamieson
C. H. Cooke

Carter Galt
L. D. Larsen

PAAUHAU SUGAR PLANTATION CO.

(Directors)

Z. Y. Howard
P. E. Spalding
A. T. Dunbar

John D. McKee
C. F. Jacobson

Starr Bruce
J. B. McCargar

PEPEKEO SUGAR CO.

(Directors)

W. Pullar
R. A. Anderson
Phillip E. Spalding

L. D. Larsen
W. Jamieson

E. A. R. Ross
H. T. Kay

PIONEER MILL CO., LTD.

(Directors)

J. P. Cooke
H. M. Dowsett
H. P. Faye
S. C. Kennedy

S. M. Lowery
W. H. McInerny
G. W. Sumner

H. A. Walker
G. P. Wilcox
E. H. Wodehouse

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII

SAN CARLOS MILLING CO., LTD.

(Directors)

G. R. Carter
C. F. Damon
G. W. Fisher

W. F. Frear
W. H. McInerny
A. H. Rice

M. A. Robinson
G. F. Straub
J. Waterhouse

WAIALUA AGRICULTURAL CO., LTD.

(Directors)

F. C. Atherton
A. G. Budge
H. K. L. Castle
S. N. Castle

A. L. Castle
C. H. Cooke
A. S. Davis
J. H. Midkiff

J. S. McCandless
H. M. Richards
J. D. McInerny
P. K. McLean

WAILUKU SUGAR CO.

(Directors)

W. Jamieson
E. A. R. Ross
P. E. Spalding

C. H. Cooke
L. D. Larsen

J. L. P. Robinson
A. Lewis, Jr.

WAIMANALO SUGAR CO.

(Directors, 1943)

P. E. Spalding
R. McCorriston
L. D. Larsen

E. A. R. Ross
W. Jamieson

H. T. Kay
F. J. Belcher, Jr.

EAST MAUI IRRIGATION CO., LTD.

(Directors)

H. A. Baldwin
F. F. Baldwin

John Waterhouse
J. Platt Cooke

R. G. Bell

THE VON HAMM-YOUNG CO., LTD.

(Directors)

R. A. Anderson
E. E. Bodge
E. R. Cameron

C. F. Damon
W. F. Dillingham
W. E. Ecklund

E. L. Knickerbocker
Duncan McBryde
J. A. Pell

ADVERTISER PUBLISHING CO.

(Directors)

Lorrin P. Thurston
Robert S. Thurston
W. F. Dillingham

Raymond Coll, Sr.
Allan McGuire

S. N. Castle
H. P. Faye

KAHULUI RAILROAD CO., LTD.

(Directors)

F. F. Baldwin
John Waterhouse

J. Platt Cooke
R. G. Bell

J. F. Morgan
John T. Waterhouse

KAUAI TERMINAL, LTD.

(Directors)

John Waterhouse
J. Platt Cooke
R. G. Bell

A. L. Dean
John Sandison
J. W. Speyer

J. F. Morgan
John T. Waterhouse

KAUAI ELECTRIC CO., LTD.

(Directors)

John Waterhouse
J. Platt Cooke
R. G. Bell

James F. Morgan
John T. Waterhouse

D. L. Oleson
John Sandison

MATSON NAVIGATION CO.

(Directors)

W. P. Roth
F. A. Bailey
Starr Bruce
A. G. Budge

W. W. Crocker
G. G. Montgomery
J. W. Speyer
A. P. Welch

P. E. Spalding
H. A. Walker
John Waterhouse
Norman Chandler

ULUPALAKUA RANCH, LTD.

(Directors)

F. F. Baldwin
John Waterhouse

J. Platt Cooke
R. G. Bell

Edward K. Baldwin
J. F. Morgan

WAIMEA SUGAR MILL CO., LTD.

(Directors)

H. A. Walker
H. P. Faye

G. W. Sumner
S. M. Lowery

A. E. Faye
L. A. Faye

WAIHAOLE WATER CO., LTD.

(Directors)

H. A. Walker
H. P. Faye
G. W. Sumner

W. F. Dillingham
S. M. Lowery
J. W. Glover

W. H. McInerny
G. P. Wilcox
E. H. Wodehouse

KAHUA RANCH, LTD.

(Directors)

F. C. Atherton
C. J. Henderson

Atherton Richards
H. M. Richards

G. W. Sumner
R. K. Von Holt

WAIHI ELECTRIC CO., LTD.

(Directors)

H. A. Walker
H. P. Faye
G. W. Sumner
S. M. Lowery

E. H. W. Broadbent
T. A. Cooke
E. W. Jamieson
W. H. Rice

Sinclair Robinson
P. E. Spalding
G. P. Wilcox

EAST KAUAI WATER CO., LTD.

(Directors)

H. A. Walker
H. P. Faye
G. W. Sumner

S. M. Lowery
F. W. Jamieson

T. A. Cooke
J. P. Wilcox

HAWAIIAN CANE PRODUCTS, LTD.

(Directors)

W. F. Dillingham
J. F. Thadiken
G. H. Angus

A. L. Dean
H. M. Richards
C. F. Weeber

L. D. Larsen
G. W. Sumner
George S. Waterhouse

CHARLES BREWER ESTATE, LTD.

(Directors)

F. W. Jamieson
P. K. McLean
J. E. Midkiff

G. P. Wilcox
R. B. Anderson

A. C. Wilcox
F. Franks

HALEAKALA RANCH CO.

(Directors)

H. A. Baldwin
Richard H. Baldwin

J. Walter Cameron
S. A. Baldwin

Leslie Bisset

C. B. HOFGAARD & CO., LTD.

(Directors)

R. E. White
H. P. Faye
G. W. Sumner

F. R. West
S. M. Lowery
L. A. Faye

W. C. Foster
W. W. Monahan

HENRY MAY & CO., LTD.

(Directors)

R. E. White
H. P. Faye
G. W. Sumner

S. M. Lowery
M. L. Berlinger

W. C. Foster
W. W. Monahan

MOLOKAI RANCH, LTD.

(Directors)

George P. Cooke
T. A. Cooke
Charles M. Cooke III

P. E. Spalding
Robert M. Cooke

George P. Cooke, Jr.
Ralph P. Johnson

HONOLULU IRON WORKS

(Directors)

T. C. Davies
J. E. Russell
G. H. Angus

C. V. Bennett
C. P. Hunter
E. H. Wodehouse

Gus E. Schaefer
A. G. Smith
J. Platt Cooke

KUKAIAU RANCH CO., LTD.

(Directors)

T. C. Davies
J. E. Russell
E. H. Wodehouse

G. H. Angus
T. Guard

A. G. Budge
C. P. Hunter

HAWAII TRANSPORTATION CO.

(Directors)

Merwin B. Carson
Henry S. Turner

M. W. Mitchel

Gaylord P. Wilcox

AHUKINI TERMINAL CO., LTD.

(Directors)

H. A. Walker
H. P. Faye
G. W. Sumner

S. M. Lowery
F. W. Jamieson

P. E. Spalding
G. P. Wilcox

WOODLAWN DAIRY & STOCK CO.

(Directors)

W. F. Dillingham
H. G. Dillingham

A. W. Van Valkenburg Dudley W. Smith

BISHOP TRUST CO., LTD.

(Directors)

W. F. Dillingham	H. A. Baldwin	G. W. Sumner
C. F. Damon	A. L. Castle	C. C. Von Hamm
Walter F. Frear	S. R. Damon	C. F. Weeber
J. K. Clarke	W. H. McInerny	Elsie H. Wilcox
J. T. MacIntyre	J. L. P. Robinson	R. E. Woolley
W. W. Chamberlain	A. G. Smith	Fred D. Lowrey
G. H. Angus		

WESTERN STATES GROCERY, HAWAII, LTD.

(Directors)

J. E. Russell	G. H. Angus	C. E. Johnson
T. Guard	E. H. Wodehouse	C. P. Hunter

MAUI PUBLISHING CO.

(Directors)

F. F. Baldwin	H. A. Baldwin	John T. Moir, Jr.
---------------	---------------	-------------------

WAIANAE CO.

(Directors)

H. A. Walker	T. Guard	A. E. Steadman
H. P. Faye	S. M. Lowery	G. P. Wilcox
G. W. Sumner	H. L'Orange	

HAWAIIAN LAND & IMPROVEMENT CO.

(Directors)

W. F. Dillingham	J. C. Walker	H. G. Dillingham, Jr.
H. G. Dillingham	A. W. Van Valkenburg	

HAWAIIAN TRUST CO., LTD.

(Directors)

C. R. Hemenway	R. B. Anderson	H. M. Richards
Peter K. McLean	F. F. Baldwin	J. E. Russell
F. W. Jamieson	G. I. Brown	W. Tenney
U. J. Rainalter	A. G. Budge	H. A. Walker
F. Franks	H. K. L. Castle	J. Waterhouse
C. Galt	J. P. Cooke	E. H. Wodehouse
J. E. Midkiff	C. J. Henderson	J. H. Worrall
A. S. Davis	R. McCorrison	F. C. Atherton

HONOLULU STAR-BULLETIN

(Directors)

Joseph R. Farrington	L. Porter Dickenson	J. F. Morgan
Riley Allen	B. C. Stearns	H. M. Richards
P. L. McIlree		

HAWAIIAN AIRLINES, LTD.

(Directors)

Merwin B. Carson	P. K. McLean	Henry S. Turner
Stanley C. Kennedy	J. E. Russell	G. P. Wilcox

MOKULEIA RANCH & LAND CO., LTD.

(Directors)

W. F. Dillingham	M. Dillingham Erdman	M. B. Dillingham
H. G. Dillingham	J. C. Lewis	

THE B. F. DILLINGHAM CO., LTD.

(Directors)

H. G. Dillingham
W. F. Frear
W. F. Dillingham

A. W. Van Valkenburg M. D. Erdman
Mary Dillingham Frear J. C. Walker

COOKE TRUST CO.

(Directors)

Alva E. Steadman
Charles M. Cooke III
Harrison R. Cooke
Gilber W. Root

P. E. Spalding R. A. Cooke, Jr.
T. A. Cooke Stephen A. Derby
Heaton L. Wren P. E. Spalding, Jr.
George P. Cooke

HENRY F. BALDWIN, LTD.

(Directors)

H. A. Baldwin
A. F. Baldwin

S. A. Baldwin H. W. Rice
F. F. Baldwin

HONOLULU LITHOGRAPH CO.

(Directors)

Joseph R. Farrington
P. L. McIlree
R. Schmidt

Frank C. Atherton A. L. Chickering
C. R. Schmidt J. T. Waterhouse

GROVE FARM CO.

(Directors)

G. P. Wilcox
Elsie H. Wilcox
Sam W. Wilcox

H. Case R. H. Sloggett
Mabel I. Wilcox G. W. Fisher

HAWAIIAN IRRIGATION CO., LTD.

(Directors)

Gus E. Schaefer
A. L. Castle

L. W. Wishard M. H. Hernshaw
F. A. Schaefer E. H. Wodehouse

KANEEOHE RANCH CO.

(Directors)

Harold K. L. Castle
Peter K. McLean
Francis Franks

James C. Castle C. R. Hemenway
Alfred L. Castle J. E. Midkiff

PACIFIC CHEMICAL & FERTILIZER CO.

(Directors)

H. A. Walker
H. P. Faye
J. T. Phillips
G. P. Wilcox

J. E. Russell L. W. Jongeneel
H. M. Dowsett P. E. Spalding
A. L. Dean H. M. Richards

WATERHOUSE INVESTMENT CO., LTD.

(Directors)

George S. Waterhouse
John Waterhouse

Arthur H. Rice Elizabeth M. Dawson
Charles A. Rice

THE BISHOP CO., LTD.

(Directors)

John Waterhouse
E. H. Wodehouse

George S. Waterhouse H. G. Dillingham
John Russell

HAWAII CONSOLIDATED RAILWAY, LTD.

(Directors)

H. A. Walker
A. J. Lafferty

J. H. Worrall
C. R. Hemenway

J. Waterhouse
George T. Coulter

LEWERS & COOKE, LTD.

(Directors)

Frederick D. Lowery
Farrant L. Turner
E. Lewers Paris

Theodore A. Cooke
Cyril F. Damon

Frederick W. Jamieson
P. E. Spalding

DILLINGHAM TRANSPORTATION CO., LTD.

(Directors)

W. F. Dillingham
W. F. Frear

H. G. Dillingham
H. M. Richards

H. A. Mountain

HAWAIIAN BROADCASTING SYSTEM

(Directors)

J. Howard Worrall
E. I. Parker
Riley H. Allen

Ralph E. Woolley
L. Porter Dickenson

Elmer R. Davis
Alan S. Davis

SUGAR FACTORS CO., LTD.

(Directors)

H. Alexander Walker

Philip Spalding

Gustav E. Schaefer

BANK OF HAWAII

(Directors)

F. C. Atherton
W. W. Carden
W. W. Chamberlain
J. L. Clarke
R. M. Cooke

T. A. Cooke
A. S. Davis
W. F. Dillingham
Carter Galt
C. R. Hemenway

R. McCorriston
P. E. Spalding
A. E. Steadman
H. A. Walker
Heaton L. Wren

[From the Hawaii Sentinel, December 9, 1937]

HAWAII'S HITLERS PLAN LABOR WAR

Reactionary Hawaii has "jumped the gun" in a titanic effort of American industry to smash the American labor movement in 1938, with aim to prevent election of a liberal president in 1940.

Next spring is the time chosen for opening of a struggle by employers to stop the growing upward movement of labor, and incidentally to discredit all the liberal forces of the Nation behind President Roosevelt and the New Deal ideals.

But Hawaiian industry, confident of its power, has already moved into action, begun its work of preparing, and, with all the power of local government in its hands, is openly laying plans for the warfare.

Numerous preliminary steps have already been taken, without much effort to conceal the objective of destroying unionism in the Territory, regardless of the Wagner Act.

This week three items of evidence showing the coming storm were shown in Hawaii. They were—

The Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association discarded guidance by all progressive and conciliatory elements within, seated as its 1938 masters of policy its most reactionary and dictatorial faction.

Hawaii National Guard control was prepared with view to giving command of the Honolulu regiment to men relied upon to carry out intent of ruthlessness in strike smashing in expected water-front disturbance.

Disorders obviously designated to provoke riots and invoke police action were created to break up a meeting of the Hawaii Federation of Labor, and so enable press prediction of imminent collapse of that new labor movement.

These events mean, say liberals and labor observers, that Hawaii is off to a flying start in American reaction's "Wreck Roosevelt" drive, designed to destroy labor union growth—and particularly CIO—and to try to win the 1938 Congress elections by fear and terrorism.

Hawaii's sugar men, allied with the shipping lines which plan to make Honolulu a concentration point for nonunion seamen when the big Pacific coast maritime labor war opens, held their annual meeting.

Standpat policies on labor were announced. No ideas of conciliation with complaining toilers were advanced or encouraged. Intent was made clear to adhere to a policy of saving the status, of decrying as "agitation" all suggestion of effort to meet basic complaints of workers.

At one point Alexander Budge, retiring president, under whom the 8-hour mill day, better housing, and other labor easements have come, urged action to increase effort for industrial peace by negotiation. The idea was not even discussed.

One question talked over in camera was that of possible NLRB rulings touching plantation labor. The subject took on added pertinence at news reports that California crop industrialists are decrying what they call arbitrary and unwarranted usurpation of power by NLRB in attempting to extend its jurisdiction to those engaged in agriculture.

The sugar men tried in vain to vision any farm industry in California more subject to Wagner law ruling, and collective bargaining, than their own field and mill industry with its 50,000 employees of 33 concerns.

The thought of a union labor specter over the plantations, and under government sanction, gave them chills. They much prefer, as in 1936, getting a \$75,000,000 crop at \$25,000,000 labor cost.

Under aegis of the Territorial government plans are laid, it became known, for ruthless use of the militia in maritime or other labor troubles. Such is the aim behind the sudden switching of colonels of the Two Hundred and Ninety-eighth and Two Hundred and Ninety-ninth Regiments, it became known.

Col. Gordon C. Ross, Two Hundred and Ninety-ninth, is slated to take over the Oahu regiment. He is a minor official of C. Brewer & Co., sugar, and is relied upon to carry out employer plans to suppress unionism in Hawaii, wherein there is harmony evident among Territorial government forces.

Mainland labor interests, apprised of the Hawaii National Guard change, are quietly investigating. Opening of this inquiry, with likelihood of protest at Washington, was followed by an order by Gov. J. B. Poindexter delaying the change from December 5 to January 1.

Expected labor trouble has been one feature, it is said, in retention of Col. P. M. Smoot, as Hawaii National Guard chief, despite the uproar of his regime and his bondsmen being forced to pay some \$5,000 financial shortages to the United States Army. Smoot is regarded by big employers as a staunch ally. Under him the guard has been recruited largely from antiunion sources. Big business and its allies employ almost all the Hawaii National Guard officers, and there has been close cooperation with sugar plantations in recruiting policies.

CIO-AFL troubles have held place in the antilabor program. Under their cloud agents have been able to start fights and brawls to be exploited to discredit labor. The week brought one row forcing end of an Hawaiian Islands Federation of Labor meeting, followed by press reports that the labor federation is collapsing. Recent reinstatement in office of the federation president was followed in a few days by his imprisonment for 4 months on a minor charge.

Especially is the CIO "menace" pushed in the arguments for the government-employer combination to smash Hawaii's budding unionism. CIO power in maritime and longshore work has caused spread of the CIO urge among other workers, such as the street-railway men.

The latter group has a CIO charter, with organization in progress. Against it is posed a "company" union of AFL hook-up, and this week the CIO men issued a paper with outcry that the employer is violating the Wagner Act by alleged aid given the AFL group.

That the Hawaii antilabor set-up is part of a national scheme is seen in charges lately made by J. Warren Madden, Chairman of NLRB, that officials of other industrial cities are conniving to violate the Wagner law by permitting union organizers to be beaten up. Mr. Madden's charge was made at the United States Conference of Mayors at Washington.

[From the Hawaii Sentinel, August 12, 1937].

ANOTHER HAWAIIAN SUGAR PLANTERS' ASSOCIATION SCANDAL

Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association seizure of Territorial court power for use to terrify 100,000 workers in Hawaii has become an open issue.

Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association was virtually put on trial on that charge this week in the case of the nine Filipino union leaders from Maui.

And Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association's plea to the indictment is on the record, so weak as to amaze and so damning as to startle.

Weak in its defense of strong-arm injustice; damning in its accusations of responsible public officials.

"Employed by the Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association to send us to jail," avers a defendant of ex United States district judge William B. Lymer as Lymer begins picking a jury.

And Lymer replies with virtual confession that he is an intruder, an adventurer, an unemployed seeker of contingent fees, allowed by the attorney general of Hawaii to take over a public courtroom for Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association's private ends and for his own quest of money.

"I have not received a penny for my services," the morning paper quotes him. Not been promised a penny. "I was employed by Mr. Bevins (Maui public prosecutor) with full concurrence of the attorney general. I shall present my bill to the Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association and it will probably pay my bill."

In parts of America where men are free and civilized, and where public officials do their duty without truckling to money dominance, private use of court powers and public treasure for revenge upon strikers ceased long ago.

If Hawaii's public-paid lawyers can't do the work they are paid for in matters so simple as pressing an ordinary petty misdemeanor case against poverty-stricken cane-field workers they ought to resign.

Blah about legal ethics and duty serves only to add public insult to public injury.

It is no less than a public scandal—and one more Hawaii betrayal of the Roosevelt promises to American labor—that we are treated to the Lymer spectacle.

[From the Hawaii Sentinel, August 4, 1938]

NO PEACE IN PARADISE

There is no peace in Paradise. Strikes, alleged bomb plots, and now mowing down of workers by police guns.

And the record will show that it is not union men who have destroyed the peace of Hawaii, but capital bent upon showing "who's boss around here."

Before the strike broke, organized workers asked that a fair arbitration board take over the controversy and they would abide by its decision. Capital said we can't arbitrate "our principles." What has followed is the result of "those principles."

For a time it looked like peace again in Paradise, negotiations were almost complete for end of the strike. Then the coincident of the tip-off to the daily press by the public relations counsel of capital, of a mysterious dynamite plot, involving the union men negotiating for peace. This publicity stunt sailed the flagship of the Inter-Island but it ended in unmasking the man in the labor movement who was known to be friendly to capital, off the record.

Peace again appeared within reach, labor was in a mood of give and take after its vindication, at the dynamite trial.

Then the guns boomed in Hilo, August 1. The Hilo Chamber of Commerce, dominated by reactionary businessmen, put pressure on their stooge sheriff and he announced he would use "armed force" against any move of labor to demonstrate against the arrival of the "scab flagship." He did and 36 men and women went to the hospital with bayonet wounds and buckshot, dum-dum pellets, which can kill a deer at 100 yards, in their bodies. Only guardian angels protected the workers from being killed.

And the answer of Sheriff Martin to his bloody act was, he was trying to protect the workers from being slaughtered by 84 armed-to-the-teeth guards aboard the flagship of the Inter-Island.

This is the evidence. Let the general public act as the jury and decide if labor is guilty of breaking the peace of Paradise, or capital with its bad faith, agents provocateurs and stubborn hate of organized labor has brought chaos to Paradise.

[From the Hawaii Sentinel, August 4, 1938]

UNION HEAD, SHERIFF'S BROTHER TELL TRUE STORY OF HILO RIOT

HILO, August 4.—“They shot us down like a herd of sheep. We didn't have a chance. The firing kept up for about 5 minutes. They just kept on pumping buckshot bullets into our bodies. They shot men in the back as they ran. They ripped their bodies with bayonets. They shot men who were trying to help wounded comrades and women. It was just plain slaughter, brother.”

Between half choked sobs, Harry Kamoku, president of ILWU 1-36, stunned and grief stricken since the bloody episode on the wharf in Hilo Monday, tried to paint a picture of what happened that day.

“The paper says 36 were shot down. They mean more than that. They mean only 36 union men. There were others who got it, too—plenty of other people, about 50 in all.

“Most of us were sitting down—about 500 of us—some were standing, talking peacefully together—about 65 feet from the shed of the wharf where the cops were standing with their riot guns—their fixed bayonets, submachine guns—their tear gas bombs.

“We are all just gathered there peacefully talking together. I heard somebody holler ‘look what they're doing to Red.’ I turned in that direction and saw two cops were pouncing on Red—one of the union brothers. I and others walked in the direction.

“Then the firing started. I threw myself flat on the ground. They fired a few rounds and then started again. I looked around, men and women were lying on the ground. I heard loud groans. I heard screams. Everything happened so fast. I saw cops running after the crowd, shooting them in the back as they ran.

“I saw one of our union sisters lying on the ground. I went over to help her. She was wounded and bleeding. I called to another brother for help. Then I heard a cop say, ‘Keep moving.’ Then the cops said: ‘Let them have it.’ The cop kept prodding us as we helped our sister off. Groans and screams everywhere—and a few of the boys just lying there still as if they were dead.

“Then people came to help—to carry them off to the hospital. It was terrible. Your own brothers and sisters bleeding from bayonet wounds and bullet wounds. helpless.

“They even shot men who came back to pick up the wounded.

“The cops say in the papers that they shot low for the legs. But we were sitting down. How could they shoot us in the legs? Our boys are in the hospital with wounds in the face—in the groin—in the arms—in the head. Is that what they call shooting at the legs?

“Hilo hospital is just overcrowded with the wounded. All the boys have volunteered blood transfusions for Bert Nakano. He's putting up a wonderful fight. He's had two transfusions already.

“Mrs. Anna Kamahale got a bullet through her near the lung. The doctors are afraid to operate. It's pretty bad.

“Takeo Aono is ripped through the left side by a bullet. His condition is critical, too.

“It's terrible, brother. It's slaughter. Plain slaughter of innocent people. If there is a God in heaven, I hope those guilty for this will get their just due. I can't talk about it anymore. They even refused to let us pick up our wounded.”

[From the Hawaii Sentinel, April 7, 1938]

STORY BEHIND AAA WAGE INCREASE

[It is interesting to note that the local sugar-coated press has failed to reveal to the public just how the United States Department of Agriculture issued the unexpected edict to increase the wages of the 1937 plantation workers to \$2.10 a day.

They had led the people to think that the sugar leaders had at last year's hearing of the AAA just stepped up and convinced the AAA representative that Hawaii's workers were the highest paid of American agricultural laborers.

They did not reveal that the Sentinel at the time of the hearing, learning that the meeting would be called without labor getting a chance to reveal its side of the question filed a letter demanding that the hearing period be extended in order that labor be heard.

This request was met by an arrogant refusal on the part of the AAA representative who was too busy at his Royal Hawaiian suite cocktail parties to extend the time of the hearing. He, like one of his predecessors, has been influenced by the spirit of sugar aloha. He spent a week in Hawaii but finished the hearing in 5 hours and all who spoke were officials of the Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association and they characterized labor trouble in Hawaii as due to mainland agitators.

Such arrogance and wanton disregard of the provisions of the AAA processing tax law passed by Congress, was then called to the attention of Henry Wallace, United States Secretary of Agriculture, by the Sentinel in an air mail special delivery letter. It asked that labor be given its right to be heard as provided for under the law.

Wallace quickly revealed that he was not party to his minion's tactics in Hawaii. Back shortly after came a radiogram from J. L. LeCron, assistant to Wallace declaring: "although time for filing briefs which was extended December 18 has expired you may send data which you or your associates or other interested parties may wish to submit regarding matters under investigation since the act requires investigation as well as public hearing."

This radiogram was turned over to Edward Berman, CIO representative in Hawaii. Berman proved a good man for the job. He and his associates got busy and gathered the data required by Washington. He then wired his Washington office to see that this data was filed and considered there.

That his facts were worthy of consideration and conclusive appears now to be beyond question.

It was a job well done, Berman, and proves your right to help and lead the worker in Hawaii in his battle for a more decent share of the profits of industry. The plantation workers of Hawaii owe Berman a great debt of gratitude. We hope they will not forget it. He has proved the worth of a solid front for labor in Hawaii irrespective of racial origin.

[From the Hawaii Sentinel, February 25, 1945]

HOW DEMOCRACY CAN WIN IN HAWAII

Hawaii's voting puzzles Washington.

Mainland politicians are asking what is wrong.

"Why did we lose Hawaii so badly in '36 in a sweep that shook the Nation?"
Ask Democrats.

"How did we elect a delegate in '32 and then lose in '34 and '36?"

This writing answers them.

To do it we go back a long way, then come on to tell what should be done and why, as we see it.

No one can see aright what Hawaii does in politics today but by a glimpse at history.

Then it is clear that Hawaii gets its politics for economics, not from party principle or tradition.

Hawaii was annexed, not as an American area or entity, not from sentiment, but as a business deal.

Late last century Hawaii's sugar set out to get into the United States market duty-free.

For land and profit sugar men decided to toss out the monarchy here and by good old gangster means they did so.

But President Cleveland balked them, would not stain his party to help them, turned down their plans.

So they waited, marked time, kept gun control here—and got Hawaii in by a deal with Mark Hanna's McKinley crowd.

Some say Hawaii would have been loyal to Democracy if Cleveland had "gone along."

Not so. Its masters needed the Republican tariff system.

So much for the economics.

Now for the human side.

Up to annexation Hawaii's voters knew no American parties or politics.

"Democrat" or "Republican" meant nothing to them.

Hawaii was not even all-American in blood of the men who ganged up on its royalty.

England, as well as Boston, had its missionaries who prayed and preyed here—and the Union Jack is still part of Hawaii's flag.

German money and German voices both talked here then, and did up to World War days.

Portuguese and Spanish were here and Hawaii's natives, too, got the ballot.

In a fair field, then, Democratic and Republican parties would have come up here as elsewhere.

They did not because profit, not party nor patriotism, was at the root of the whole deal.

The men who dealt with Hanna were cold realists who knew what they wanted, how to get it and how to nail it down.

In the main, they wrote their own ticket in the framing of our organic law and they put into it what it took to seat them in local power and glue them into the seats.

What chance had democracy in that setup?

None. For many years here to be known as a Democrat was to draw fire, be ostracised, rated as a bit queer.

And why not? In an area with all land, industry, business, banks, money, jobs, public offices and powers giving service, reverence, worship to stand-pat Republicanism?

Under McKinley, Theodore Roosevelt, Taft, the Republican money-system in Hawaii thrived.

Wilson rule made no dents in it and in war years gave the Republicans a free hand that sugar might help win the war.

Then Harding, Coolidge, Hoover; each term the cinch drawn tighter.

But as time passed craft called for some pretences of party division here.

Too raw would be absolute rule; it would make talk in Congress.

So a false democracy was built here to stage sham battles, but not to win.

One rich man who wanted Democratic honors put up the money to make race after race for Delegate for years, always beaten.

But in the Hoover revolt year of '32 came a miracle. Combining a slogan, strong organization and money the rich man won.

Hawaii sent a Democrat to Washington, but even then it did it by consent of ruling Republican powers.

That year the Republican Delegate out for reelection was in bad with the party lords for ignoring orders given him and they sent out the command to knife him.

In '34 the old regime took charge again and still holds on.

That's why '36 meant nothing here.

Fake Democrats, financed by and acting for Republican rulers, throw dust in Washington eyes when they say all is well with democracy here or that they speak for anyone but the powers of prey.

They try to alibi to Mr. Farley with pleas that the party has no press for its message in Hawaii, hiding the fact that they obey the foes of Roosevelt and that the voters know it and have spurned them as leaders.

Hawaii believes in Roosevelt ideals, and its free voters will not help crooked bipartisan bosses betray those ideals to Republican reaction.

If the Democrats at Washington want to see a real Democratic party here they must free Hawaii from rule by the plunderbund.

They must free our Democratic voters from fear of losing their jobs, from terror of economic and social reprisals.

They can do it by giving President Roosevelt what he has asked for—power to send us a Governor who is free from local control, free to forward here the Roosevelt social and political aims.

Never before has the Democratic Party had so big a chance for service to itself and Hawaii as now.

Never again, perhaps, will that chance come.

Congress should give the President what he asked.

Pass the Rankin Bill now.

[From the Hawaii Sentinel, November 11, 1937]

HEARING RECORDS GRABBED TO BE "FIXED" LOCALLY

CONGRESS DEFTED BY STATEHOODERS

In direct defiance of the joint commission of Congress, Hawaii's Big Business is "editing" the record of the commission on the recent statehood hearings here.

Result is outcry that again an important public document on statehood is to be falsified.

Discovery of the seizure of the record by prostatehood forces was made this week by the Sentinel.

Prof. N. B. Beck of the University of Hawaii admits that, on orders of Delegate Samuel W. King, he has taken possession of the entire official record so far written.

Hundreds of pages have already been delivered to Beck.

Wires of protest have been sent to member of the Joint Commission.

Two years ago, by a like maneuver, the same group, now again using Professor Beck, so manipulated the official record as to delete much material.

The material then cut out revealed facts on economic and race issues.

Senator Joseph W. O'Mahoney, of Wyoming, told of intent to again manipulate the official record, objected this year to Beck's being permitted to handle the transcript of proceedings.

Delegate King's offer relating to Beck was then turned down. The chairman, Senator King, of Utah, ordering that the record be sent by the stenographers to Washington for any editing or indexing the Commission might find necessary.

Falsification of a record of Congress as that of the statehood hearings, constitutes contempt, and all concerned in such offense may be penalized by imprisonment.

Orders against letting Beck touch the official record were given 5 minutes before the Commission adjourned sine die. They came as result of a colloquy following Sam King's offer to have Beck "edit and arrange" the material.

"Since coming here," Senator O'Mahoney then said. "I have been told that the record of a prior inquiry of the same nature here 2 years ago was handled by these same University of Hawaii people, and that some important facts were omitted in the compilation of the record.

"Moreover, we have here situation where these university people have appeared here as prostatehood witnesses. It seems to me it would be wrong for us to turn over the record to one party in the controversy for any purpose. I think the record had best be kept in our own control. I ask that the official reporter be directed to send the report to Washington without editing or indexing."

"Yes," said Chairman King. "If there is any objection by a member to accepting the offer of Delegate King the record will be handled accordingly."

Later the stenographers were specifically warned not to allow the record to be handled by anyone but themselves until after delivery at Washington.

But now, it develops, on claim that the steno's services were being paid by the Territory, demand was made for delivery of the transcript to Beck.

Over 600 pages of the only record Congress can obtain of the proceedings here, have already been delivered to Beck.

"I am only editing it for spelling and grammatical errors," Beck told the Sentinel. "I was not there when the Commission discussed the subject. But Sam King ordered the record given to me. He told me the Commission has voted 15 to 1 to have me edit it."

The part of the record already given Professor Beck for "editing" contains much of the vital material on dual citizenship, Japanese schools, Big Five control, grand jury corruption, protection of criminals, bipartisan unity on race issues and illegal water seizures by sugar corporations.

Professor Beck was one of the University of Hawaii prostatehood witnesses and an active figure in preparing witnesses and evidence for the Commission hearings. He was among those hotly cross-examined by both Representatives and Senators of the Commission.

Because of omissions of exhibits and deletions of vital testimony of the 1935 hearings in the record as "edited" by Professor Beck, advance warning was given Commission members of danger of another falsified record. One witness wrote letters to Chairman King and others charging intent to mislead Congress again this year. So when Delegate King rose with his motion to let Beck take over the record and exhibits Senator O'Mahoney was ready.

Congressional hearing records are always regarded by Congress in the light of like court records. Only by specific order, unanimously agreed, are they ever edited as to language, spelling, or otherwise.

The records turned over to Beck include testimony of the most sensational nature, exposing many evils caused by control of Hawaii's Government and affairs by the interests employing and controlling Professor Beck. His direct

superior, President Crawford of the university, was chairman of the prostatehood committee, known to be averse to suppressing facts injurious to big business. President Crawford was one of the guests of the consul general of Japan at an "appreciation" dinner two days after the Commission left Hawaii.

[From the Hawaii Sentinel, April 7, 1938]

LUMBER TRUST TO FACE PROSECUTION

Federal prosecution of the local lumber trust, under the Sherman Antitrust Act and the Clayton Act, is now set for an early trial, it was learned this week from a reliable source.

Pressure to bring those connected with this trust is understood to have come from Washington as the result of numerous complaints filed there by local resident Army engineers that the high cost of building materials is causing local national defense contracts to cost far more than the same contracts would cost on the mainland United States.

Conclusive facts as to the manipulations of this trust is understood to be in the hands of the Army engineers as the result of a close scrutiny of the most of building materials used in WPA and PWA contracts, which are now both under their control.

Comparative prices of lumber and other building materials as sold on the mainland United States are understood to have been checked. And a probe of just how these prices have been hijacked by the lumber trust in Hawaii is also declared to have been secured.

The part played by the steamship companies apparently in a working agreement with the lumber trust is another phase of the situation which has been checked.

How the trust then manipulates prices to fit its own whims was probed as well as the manner in which they keep out those who have attempted to enter their lucrative field of profit.

The manipulation of one independent company which was finally forced to the wall by the trust and the inside of how it was brought to its knees by agents of the trust and their financial allies is another turn the investigation is said to have taken.

The trial is expected to bring out the fact that it now costs less to ship lumber from the Pacific coast to China or Japan than it does to ship the same lumber to Hawaii.

Because of the interest Washington has in the case, and the necessity to keep building costs down in Hawaii in the projected large national defense projects, the Federal Government is expected to watch the case closely. It was learned that there is possibility that Washington may send one of its crack trust busters to Hawaii to aid the local Federal attorney's office.

[From the Hawaii Sentinel, December 3, 1937]

WASHINGTON EYES ILLS OF HAWAII

Congress Committees on Judiciary, Foreign Relations, Military Affairs, Labor, Agriculture, and Territories all got facts urging quick clean-up of bad government in Hawaii this week.

Amazing, astounding, and startling were events in the local scene revealing evils in Hawaii's rule.

Coincident came a big revolt of Democrats with demand that Republican rule under F. D. R. be ended by action of Gov. J. B. Poindexter.

Congress issues bursting into the open, involving the vital fight to end big business' octopus grip on all Hawaii power, were:

Judiciary.—Open showing that Hawaii's court system has broken down in the face of Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association's fight to smother the free press; all judges on Oahu running away from duty of trials; supreme court chief justice exposed in side-money estate grab sends 250 miles to Hilo and gets a prejudiced judge to try criminal cases against his critics.

Foreign relations.—Far East dangers from arousing Philippine anger and distrust by oppression of Filipino laborers in Hawaii plantations near airing in

free press battle in Hawaii courts; claimed United States Army prestige in Philippines periled by conduct of retired high officer acting for sugar industry to be court issue.

Military affairs.—Retired high United States Army officer reveals publicly in presence of aliens plans for defense of Hawaii in event of emergency; Hawaii National Guard long held under command of adjutant general found thousands of dollars short in accounts, but defended by Governor.

Labor.—Hawaii employers war on Wagner Act and labor-union movement; Honolulu Rapid Transit Co. resists CIO plans by espionage and menace; 48,000 sugar mill and field workers may be deprived of AAA benefits.

Agriculture.—AAA holds rush session on "fair wage and fair cane price" issue involving \$22,000,000, without hearing testimony in behalf of 48,000 workers or any American small growers qualified to share process tax money; only testimony heard is from sugar industrial chiefs; press silence aids plan to add tax money to big sugar profits.

Territories.—Dismissal of nine Republicans in high-paid key and cabinet places demanded of Governor Poindexter by island precinct clubs; movement to oust two circuit judges from Democratic Party on charges of broken party pledges.

Thus does 1 week's grist from troubled Hawaii bring work for the mills at Washington.

Details of the various events appear in this edition.

[From the Hawaii Sentinel, March 31, 1938]

QUICK ACTION DEMANDED ON FOOD PROBLEM HERE

WASHINGTON, D. C., March 31.—Hawaii must increase its local food production by diversified farming, even if sugar acreage has to be cut.

It must do its part to prepare to protect America's Gibraltar of the Pacific for the crisis that now looms in the Pacific area.

It must be able to supply the needed food for the service personnel as well as its civilian population to meet any crisis which might arise in the Pacific.

This is part of the mandate that was handed recently to Hawaii's Delegate to Congress, Samuel Wilder King, by high-ranking Washington officials close to President F. D. Roosevelt and the Secretary of War.

It was also learned that startling lack of food preparedness was pointed out to President Roosevelt recently at a conference with a member of the statehood congressional committee who made this subject his particular business while he was in Hawaii last year.

This Member of Congress is known to have pointed out to the President that Hawaii's two crop system is not only a menace to America's strategic naval base at Pearl Harbor, but it is denying the people of the Territory their natural right to own and develop small food-producing farms.

It was learned here that Delegate King, realizing that big business in Hawaii is on the spot for its failure to do its part in protecting America's Singapore of the Pacific, has wired to leaders of Hawaii's big business to get busy immediately on some program which will show Washington that they are prepared to do their part to meet any Pacific emergency.

Delegate King is understood to have warned Hawaii officials as well as business leaders that failure to act immediately to remedy this situation will see Washington step into the picture to put into effect its own plan.

It is known here in official circles that the turning over of the Hawaii WPA to Army engineers is just the beginning of closer control of the affairs of the Territory which touch problems of national defense.

Failure of Hawaii to get busy immediately on a program to increase local food production will see the problem turned over also to the Army engineers now in charge of the WPA.

[From the Hawaii Sentinel, March 18, 1937]

ICC ASKED TO END BIG SHIP RATE PLOT

Charges that the Matson Steamship Co. and the Inter-Island Steamship Co. are violating the Sherman Antitrust Act and, by a system of interlocking directorates blocking the production and sale of foodstuffs grown in Hawaii

have been filed with the Interstate Commerce Commission at Washington, D. C., it was learned this week from a reliable source.

It has been further charged, it was learned, that these two companies, by a pooling agreement, are directly responsible for the high shipping rates on products brought to Honolulu from the outside islands.

This agreement, it is declared, permits the Matson Co. to bring to Hawaii annually from the mainland around 300,000,000 pounds of foodstuffs, without fear of facing competition from locally grown foodstuffs.

This is said to be accomplished by keeping the rates for food shipped from outside islands so high that local merchants see no reason to buy or encourage the production of locally grown foodstuffs when they can get the mainland products just as cheaply.

Proof of this interlocking system has been furnished to the Interstate Commerce Commission. It was revealed to them that of the 292,500 shares of the Inter-Island Co., 55,000 shares of the company are owned by the Matson Co., 11,000 shares by Castle & Cooke, agents for the Matson Co., locally.

In addition to these shares it is also understood that another 100,000 shares are well scattered among those linked with the Matson Co., assuring the officials of that company control over the operations and rates of the Inter-Island Co.

It was also learned that it has been charged in the communication to Mr. Ickes for the Washington commission, that behind this pooling agreement to block the local small farm industry is a determination of those interested in the big sugar and pineapple plantations to prevent, if possible, the encroachments of the small farmers in the field to secure desired Territorial-owned land now leased by those interests.

Also it was disclosed that one of the reasons for the opposition by the Matson Co. to production of locally grown food is that if anything should eliminate the transportation to Hawaii of this vast quantity of food from the mainland, it would have one of its best sources of revenue destroyed and assurance of a full cargo load bound for Hawaii would be lost. At the present time Matson ships are generally assured full cargo load of foodstuffs from the mainland and full cargoes of sugar out of Honolulu.

These facts, as well as others, are declared to have been placed in the hands of Harod L. Ickes, head of the United States Interior Department, to be turned over to the Interstate Commerce Commission. It was also learned that, as result of the filing of these charges, a man has already been selected by the Commission to come to Hawaii.

Activity in the office of the Inter-Island Steamship Co. this week in gathering statistical mater seemed to indicate that the officials of the company have already been tipped off as to coming action by Washington officials.

Possibility that an announcement of a voluntary decrease in rates may be made, aimed to forestall the investigation, was whispered this week about the Merchant Street gossip centers.

Behind this move to change the present set-up blocking the production of locally grown food is declared to be the War Department at Washington. This pressure is said to be the result of reports sent to Washington by high ranking Army and Navy officials that "it looks as if the only way to force action on this situation is to get the War Department on the job." The feeling that it was wasting words to try to get something done locally has been prevalent for some time with Hawaii-stationed Army and Navy officials, it was learned.

Word of coming action from Washington caused confusion in the Hawaii Legislature, where ship lobbyists see endangered their plans for holding action to limits of futile make-believe. A senate resolution would have Secretary Ickes asked to have investigation made by the Maritime Commission, which lately made a fizzle of interposing in the sea tie-up.

Under this measure the inquiry would be limited to "the fairness and reasonableness of the rates and charges" of Inter-Island. Such an inquiry would not touch the vital points as to existence of any unlawful agreement restricting interstate commerce, and would be by a body known to be friendly to ship line interests.

The Maritime Commission has no power under law to probe into alleged rate conspiracies by carriers. The ICC, however, compels carriers to submit their books and witnesses, open hearings on complaints, and issues and enforces orders based on its findings. Its investigations have often resulted in indictments and prosecutions under the Sherman law.

The complaint made to Secretary Ickes was submitted, it is said, on the theory that the Government is interested in the large phase of alleged illegalities and discriminations; that Mr. Ickes is more averse to correct widespread abuses than to cure the small ills of his National Park Service, urged in the Senate as a reason for Mr. Ickes to act in the matter.

[From the Hawaii Sentinel, August 26, 1937]

KAUAI CITIZENS WANT SPOTLIGHT ON NIIHAU ISLE

Niihau, the feudal isle of the Robinson family, where citizens of the United States are denied landing in the name of private property, will soon be due for the spotlight, if certain citizens of Kauai can make their desires known to the Territorial attorney general.

Charges, that the owners of this island are holding their workers in practical peonage and denying them their constitutional rights as free American citizens, are now being prepared.

It is also charged that owners of the island, thinking that they are outside the law, are deliberately violating the educational law of the Territory which states that children must attend school up to the age of 16 years.

The sponsors of this protest also would like to know why other Territorial communities are forced to abide by the set school curriculum of the Territorial board of education while Niihau is allowed to create and put into effect not only its own curriculum but its own laws concerning the education of American citizens living on this island, which is in spite of being privately owned still part of the United States.

It will also be called to the attention of the attorney general the law concerning election ballots, which states ballots shall contain the names of both party candidates and election poll watchers shall be selected from both parties. They will point out that at Niihau nothing but Republican ballots have been allowed to be distributed.

Another factor they would like investigated is the birth rate of the island and its origin. Birth certificates now appear to be confusing in that they carry the mother's name most often while the father's seems to be omitted. What this means they would like to know.

EXHIBIT 49A. PRESENTED BY JOHN F. G. STOKES

[The Hawaii Times, Saturday, November 4, 1944]

IMPORTANT NOTICE TO THE VOTERS

We, the undersigned, wish to correct a vicious rumor that is being spread by political enemies of Richard K. Kimball.

The story is being actively spread that soon after the outbreak of war Mr. Kimball advocated concentration or evacuation of all Japanese men from Hawaii.

This rumor is not true. The truth is quite the opposite. As we all know at the outbreak of war, and weeks following, there was a great deal of talk of the possible evacuation of Japanese from Hawaii.

At a meeting of a group of Americans of Japanese ancestry, aliens and others, Mr. Kimball, realizing the economic problem involved in such an evacuation and having an abiding faith in the loyalty of Japanese people in Hawaii suggested a counter proposal to avoid any mass evacuation.

He suggested even if the Japanese men had to be put under military surveillance that everyone should be kept in Hawaii and contribute their share in the war effort and in winning of the war.

Mr. Kimball was requested to present this idea to the citizens' council, composed of prominent business men of this city. We are confident that the members of that council will vouch for the truth of this statement.

At no time did Mr. Kimball advocate evacuation of any Japanese from Hawaii.

MASA STALOPIN.

E. J. MURAI.

THIRO CHAS. LIND.

CLIFTON H. YAMAMOTO.

T. MIYAMOTO.

EXHIBIT 49B. PRESENTED BY JOHN F. G. STOKES

[The Hawaii Times, Monday, November 6, 1944]

IMPORTANT NOTICE TO VOTERS

In the Saturday, November 4, issue of this paper a statement appeared, signed by five individuals, which read: "We, the undersigned wish to correct a vicious rumor that is being spread by political enemies of Richard K. Kimball.

"The story is being actively spread that soon after the outbreak of war Mr. Kimball advocated concentration or evacuation of all Japanese men in Hawaii."

These five individuals signed their names to a categorical denial, apparently without making any effort to check the record.

The following is a true copy of the statements made by Richard K. Kimball to the director of the Citizen's Council.

EXCERPT FROM MINUTES OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF CITIZEN'S COUNCIL,
MEETING HELD FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 1942, AT 10 A. M.

"The meeting was called to order by the chairman, who introduced Mr. Kimball, saying that he had a plan which he wished to present to the council.

"Mr. Kimball stated he had a plan in mind to help solve Oahu's population problem—both Japanese and of Japanese ancestry. He thought the plan would satisfy the Army and Navy authorities and at the same time allow the persons concerned to pursue a more or less normal existence. He proposed using schools or constructing in each community where Japanese people live, barracks to be surrounded by barbed-wire stockades. Each evening before dark all male persons of Japanese ancestry of 12 years of age or over would report to the barracks to spend the night there under armed guard. He stated that he had held a meeting with a number of prominent young Japanese, as well as the employees of the Halekulani Hotel and that they were all in favor of the plan.

"He also stated that he was sure the Army and Navy would approve if the plan were taken to them completely worked out and they had to supply nothing but permission to go ahead and carry it out, and that he felt all that was needed to do that was a little capital. He proposed that the businessmen of the community through the Citizen's Council underwrite the project."

The above is a verbatim statement from the record.

EXHIBIT 50A. PRESENTED BY J. G. ANDREWS

LETTER OF J. G. ANDREWS, RELATING TO PAYMENTS TO SUGARCANE PRODUCERS
HILO, T. H., December 13, 1945.

MR. WILL N. KING,
AAA Administrator,
Honolulu, T. H.

DEAR SIR: I present herewith for your consideration arguments in favor of increasing the price to be paid sugarcane producers on this island, particularly those of the Paauhau Cane Planters Association.

(1) The Paauhau Planters' cane acreage formerly was 1,400 acres; presently it is but 900 acres, the balance being pastured. This does not show a healthy condition. It proves that cane culture insofar as the small landowner is concerned does not pay. Now that a new agreement is about to be entered into between the Paauhau Sugar Plantation and landowners, there may be a few more individuals who will turn their lands into pasturage.

(2) Under the present agreement the planters receive 49½ percent of the proceeds derived from the sale of their cane, out of which all costs are deducted. These Paauhau planters do, or hire men to do, all the work necessary in raising their cane crops. The harvesting is done directly by the plantation but charged in full to the planters.

(3) Because the agreement stipulates a 7-percent interest charge for all advances made by the mill company, the plantation has strictly adhered to this phase of the agreement, in not having reduced its interest rate when interest rates over the whole country has been anywhere from 1½ to 4 percent.

(4) To process and market its sugar, the plantation charges itself 50½ percent of the proceeds. To raise and harvest a crop of cane, the farmer (on a percentage base) receives less than half. This on the face of it is an injustice to the planters.

(5) The planter receives no benefit from the sale of molasses, which I believe is something like \$14.25 a ton. Of course the planters having entered a cane planters contract are left holding the bag.

(6) The CCC payments now being made by the Federal Government is, I believe, to encourage producers, which means the farmers and landowners, to produce more cane. If that is true, why then, is this money under the planters agreement, added on to the price of sugar. It is our contention that this CCC money should rightly go in its entirety, to the planters and landowners. Under the AAA payments, the processors (meaning the milling company) gets the benefit. Personally, I am of the opinion that the milling company is chiselling when it claims the right to the CCC money as a processor. I say, let it make that claim on its own cane areas, but not on cane areas owned by others.

The actual costs of raising a crop of cane has increased tremendously, and such costs are not borne by the milling company when such expenditures are made on our own lands and under our planters agreements, therefore when the milling company claims that it is entitled to the lion's share of the CCC payments, it must remember that the planters foot all of the expenses.

We therefore feel and insist that inasmuch as we are the producers, and the CCC Act by Congress was enacted to encourage producers and not processors, we should be paid the full amount. We vehemently protest against any CCC money being made a part of the price of sugar.

We hope to be able to bring this matter to the attention of the congressional Committee on Territories in the very near future if justice is not granted.

We thank you for your consideration in this matter, which concerns our economic standing.

Respectfully submitted.

J. G. ANDREWS,
(For Paauhau Cane Planters Association.)

EXHIBIT 50B. PRESENTED BY J. G. ANDREWS

LETTER TO WILL N. KING, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, IN
REPLY TO MR. ANDREWS

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
FIELD SERVICE BRANCH,
Honolulu 16, T. H., December 17, 1945.

MR. J. G. ANDREWS,
Paauhau Cane Planters Association,
Hila, T. H.

DEAR MR. ANDREWS: This acknowledges receipt of your letter of December 13, presenting views of the Paauhau Cane Planters Association in respect to costs of sugarcane production in relation to cane prices and Government subsidies received.

Please be advised that your letter has been read into the record of the sugar hearing held December 14, 1945, at Honolulu, and a copy left with the reporter for transmission to Washington.

It may be of interest to you to know that a Mr. Pestana, son of a homesteader at Paauhau, presented himself as an interested party and read a letter to him from Mr. Gomes, president of the Paauhau Homesteaders Association, on the same subject as your letter to me. This also was made a part of the record, although it was not clear what relationship, if any, exists between the Paauhau Cane Planters Association and the Paauhau Homesteaders Association.

For your information, I will state that a copy of the record of the hearing can be purchased through arrangements with Mr. Linn, the official reporter at the hearing.

Yours very truly,

WILL N. KING,
Officer in Charge, District of Hawaii.

Returns on the 1944 cane crop of Joe Pestano, Paauhau plantation, District of Hamakua, county of Hawaii

Cane tonnage-----	tons--	1, 250. 66
Sugar tonnage-----	do--	111. 378
Expenses incurred by:		
Joe Pestano-----		\$717. 35
Paauhau plantation-----		3, 303. 04
Total expenditures-----		4, 020. 39
Payments:		
To Joe Pestano, cash-----		1, 596. 90
Deduct his expenses-----		717. 35
Total-----		879. 55
Plantation net on 1 ton of sugar-----		22. 10
111.378 tons of sugar nets plantation-----		2, 453. 00

CASE OF T. SONOMURA OF THE SAME PLACE

Acres of cane----- 14
 Two last crops after plantation expenses were deducted, left him \$692; after deducting expenses incurred by him, there was nothing left.
 These two persons may give up cane culture.

EXHIBIT 51. PRESENTED BY J. G. ANDREWS

SECTION 73, ORGANIC ACT, REVISED LAWS 1945, TERRITORY OF HAWAII, COVERS
 PUBLIC LANDS

SUGGESTED REVISION

By Joseph G. Andrews, representative, first district (East Hawaii) Territorial Legislature

Subsection (d) of the organic act of section 4542, Revised Laws, 1945:

(1) Omitting inclusion of withdrawal clause in general leases covering agricultural areas is tantamount to annulment of subsections (m) and (n) and section 4554, which grants the right to petition for the opening of lands for homestead purposes. Section 4547 practically assures a lessee permanent possession of leased lands, because the right of petition is blocked by the nonexistence of a lapse of time between the expiration of an old lease and the beginning of a new one.

(2) Subsection (m) and section 4554 makes it mandatory, upon the filing of a petition by at least 25 qualified citizens, that lands applied for be opened to the public for homesteading. This is impossible to successfully carry through at present.

(3) Section 4555, Revised Laws, 1945, authorizes the purchasing of lands for homestead purposes. This should be amended to include authorizing the condemning of improvements and crops on Government-leased agricultural lands which were and are leased with the nonwithdrawal clause. Why buy private land when Government has available lands?

(4) Section 4559, Revised Laws, 1945, and subsection (i) grants the commissioner of public lands "permissive power" which leave the applicants at his mercy. This should be made mandatory. There have been instances where applicants for repossessed homesteads have been denied their applications because of this permissive power of the commissioner. Two glaring cases of recent years are: Application of Ed. C. Searle for a homestead at Ninole-Wailau in the district of Kau and application of Manuel Chiquita for a homestead at Waiakea in the district of South Hilo near the town of Hilo.

(5) The commissioner of public lands has the power of a dictator and often ignores the legitimate requests of the legislature. The incumbent even boasts of the noneffectiveness of legislative petitions, feeling immune because of responsibility to Congress only. If this condition is to remain, then consistency should be practiced by letting him "go the whole hog" and give him the power to veto legislative apportionment of all proceeds derived from the sale of lands and of leases sold. Giving him czaristic powers to

protect the sugar industry at the expense of the people in general is comparable to giving the tax commissioner the power to throw the tax load away from the sugar industry onto the small businessman and ordinary citizen. Instance: 1944 assessed valuation left county of Hawaii sugar plantations as was, whilst homeowners had their valuations increased \$1,000,000.

EXHIBIT 55. PRESENTED BY HAWAII EQUAL RIGHTS COMMISSION

Compilation of rail line operating statistics—steam railroad companies for the years 1940, representative prewar year, and 1944—last available full year, compiled from reports on file with the public utilities commission, Territory of Hawaii

[See exhibit 6] containing further statistics on public utilities]

	Oahu Railway & Land Co.		Hawaii Consolidated Ry., Ltd.		Kahului R. R. Co.	
	1944	1940	1944	1940	1944	1940
Average length of road operated.....	85.58	85.68	81.86	81.86	42.50	42.56
Train-miles, transportation service:						
Freight.....	192,200	93,831	62,641	34,578	79,201	44,011
Passenger.....	88,493	79,015	75,359	57,542	-----	-----
Total.....	280,693	172,846	138,000	92,120	79,201	44,011
Locomotive-miles, transportation service:						
Freight.....	448,083	202,905	133,320	84,045	102,196	60,766
Passenger.....	81,779	34,391	6,300	-----	-----	-----
Total.....	529,862	237,296	139,620	84,045	102,196	60,766
Car-miles, transportation service:						
Freight.....	4,535,000	1,971,000	534,688	318,389	235,324	123,015
Passenger.....	897,966	252,355	130,668	107,835	-----	-----
Total.....	5,432,966	2,223,355	665,356	426,224	235,324	123,015
Freight service:						
Tons:						
Revenue freight.....	1,925,212	775,917	652,687	488,894	556,979	354,622
Nonrevenue freight.....	39,139	8,210	1,039	3,077	927	1
Total.....	1,964,351	784,127	653,726	491,971	557,906	354,623
Ton-miles:						
Revenue freight.....	46,860	21,121	9,583	5,739	2,697	1,243
Nonrevenue freight.....	854	176	1	155	6	5
Total.....	47,714	21,297	9,584	5,894	2,703	1,248
Passenger service:						
Passengers:						
Carried revenue.....	1,937,999	331,587	103,635	22,572	-----	-----
Miles revenue.....	24,023,500	5,106,898	1,686,252	511,781	-----	-----
Revenues and expenses:						
Freight revenue.....	\$2,702,810	\$961,221	\$1,019,955	\$563,538	\$445,653	\$217,999
Passenger revenue.....	408,672	70,934	25,017	4,472	-----	-----
Passenger service, train revenue and incidentals.....	1,282,640	966,126	186,864	94,923	88,737	730
Total operating revenues.....	4,394,122	1,998,281	1,231,836	662,933	534,390	218,729
Total operating expenses.....	4,268,395	1,645,275	835,011	486,655	389,780	192,316
Net operating revenues.....	125,727	353,003	396,825	176,278	144,610	26,413
Miscellaneous averages:						
Miles hauled: Revenue freight.....	24.34	27.22	14.68	11.74	4.84	3.51
Miles carried: Revenue passengers.....	12.40	15.40	16.27	22.67	-----	-----
Revenue per ton of freight.....	\$1.40	\$1.24	\$1.56	\$1.15	\$0.80	\$0.61
Revenue per ton-mile, freight.....	\$0.05768	\$0.04551	\$0.10599	\$0.09819	\$0.16524	\$0.17538
Revenue per passenger.....	\$0.21	\$0.21	\$0.24	\$0.20	-----	-----
Revenue per passenger-mile.....	\$0.01701	\$0.01389	\$0.01484	\$0.00874	-----	-----
Ton-miles: Revenue freight per mile of road.....	547,558	246,510	117,078	70,110	63,459	2,920.58
Revenue passenger-miles per mile of road.....	280,714	596,043	20,599	6,252	-----	-----

EXHIBIT 56. PRESENTED BY HAWAII EQUAL RIGHTS COMMISSION

Comparative statement of net paid newspaper circulation of leading newspapers, all cities 300,000 to 600,000 population and other selected cities, 1945¹

Name of city	City population, 1940 census	Population of trading area	Newspaper ¹	Total circulation ²
Atlanta, Ga.....	302, 288	1, 424, 818	Constitution (M).....	158, 830
Baton Rouge, La.....	34, 719	259, 141	Journal (E).....	198, 307
Bridgeport, Conn.....	147, 121	326, 613	Advocate (M).....	9, 213
Brooklyn, N. Y. (borough).....	2, 698, 285	4, 600, 022	State Times (E).....	22, 035
Buffalo, N. Y.....	575, 901	1, 072, 214	Post (E).....	67, 659
Cincinnati, Ohio.....	455, 610	1, 155, 703	Telegram (M).....	12, 614
Columbus, Ohio.....	306, 087	716, 619	Eagle (E).....	98, 305
Denver, Colo.....	322, 412	506, 908	Citizen (E).....	30, 113
Eugene, Oreg.....	20, 838	71, 622	Courier-Express (M).....	135, 085
Honolulu, T. H.....	179, 358	423, 330	News (E).....	249, 770
Houston, Tex.....	384, 514	958, 359	Enquirer (M).....	130, 876
Indianapolis, Ind.....	386, 972	953, 458	Post (E).....	146, 850
Jacksonville, Fla.....	173, 065	493, 136	Times-Star (E).....	151, 318
Jersey City, N. J.....	301, 173	412, 241	Citizen (E).....	75, 007
Kansas City, Mo.....	399, 178	1, 118, 624	Dispatch (E).....	136, 317
Long Beach, Calif.....	164, 271	412, 241	Post (E).....	183, 400
Louisville, Ky.....	319, 077	779, 304	Rocky Mountain News (M).....	59, 080
Minneapolis, Minn.....	492, 370	1, 355, 380	Register-Guard (E).....	21, 573
New Orleans, La.....	494, 537	925, 124	Advertiser (M).....	136, 819
Newark, N. J.....	429, 760	3, 211, 139	Star-Bulletin (E).....	140, 414
Norfolk, Va.....	144, 332	370, 544	Chronicle (E).....	143, 470
Oakland, Calif.....	302, 163	663, 588	Post (M).....	156, 041
Pasadena, Calif.....	81, 864	189, 625	Press (E).....	126, 423
Pensacola, Fla.....	37, 449	147, 304	News (E).....	111, 892
Phoenix, Ariz.....	65, 414	282, 080	Star (M).....	76, 896
Portland, Maine.....	73, 643	228, 058	Times (E).....	151, 644
Portland, Oreg.....	305, 394	585, 976	Times-Union (M).....	133, 508
Rochester, N. Y.....	324, 975	655, 665	Journal (E).....	90, 234
Sacramento, Calif.....	105, 958	285, 816	Star (E).....	104, 477
San Diego, Calif.....	203, 341	290, 376	Times (M).....	59, 321
San Francisco, Calif.....	634, 536	1, 628, 498	Press-Telegram (M).....	43, 909
Seattle, Wash.....	368, 302	562, 610	Courier-Journal (M).....	339, 536
			Times (E).....	329, 119
			Star-Journal (E).....	67, 888
			Tribune (M).....	140, 211
			Times (E).....	150, 262
			Star-Journal (E).....	250, 499
			Tribune (M).....	101, 126
			Times-Picayune (M).....	146, 108
			States (E).....	77, 484
			News (E).....	207, 690
			Star-Ledger (M).....	105, 958
			Virginian Pilot (M).....	81, 581
			Ledger-Dispatch (E).....	60, 878
			Tribune (E).....	131, 271
			Post-Enquirer (E).....	63, 492
			Star-News (E).....	23, 124
			Post (M).....	22, 668
			Journal (M).....	21, 179
			News (E).....	18, 354
			Arizona-Republic (M).....	47, 521
			Gazette (E).....	29, 425
			Press-Herald (M).....	42, 542
			Express (E).....	32, 488
			Oregonian (M).....	170, 980
			Oregon-Journal (E).....	166, 195
			Democrat-Chronicle (M).....	88, 933
			Times-Union (E).....	105, 319
			Bee (E).....	79, 535
			Union (M).....	15, 607
			Union (M).....	47, 148
			Tribune-Sun (E).....	77, 733
			Call-Bulletin (M).....	145, 899
			Examiner (M).....	213, 802
			News (E).....	137, 519
			Chronicle (M).....	145, 080
			Post-Intelligencer (M).....	144, 265
			Star (E).....	71, 533
			Times (E).....	163, 360

¹ (M) denotes morning newspaper, (E) denotes evening newspaper, Sunday editions not included.

² Figures indicate net paid circulation from audited statement of audit bureau of circulations, for period ending Sept. 30, 1944.

³ Audit bureau figures for 6-month period ending Sept. 30, 1945.

⁴ Compiled from Editor and Publisher, 1945 International Yearbook number, legislative reference bureau, Territory of Hawaii.

Comparative statement of net paid newspaper circulation of leading newspapers, all cities 300,000 to 600,000 population and other selected cities, 1945—Con.

Name of city	City population, 1940 census	Population of trading area	Newspaper	Total circulation
Schenectady, N. Y.....	87,549	147,700	(Gazette (M).....	29,660
			(Union-Star (E).....	27,645
Shreveport, La.....	98,167	547,865	(Journal (E).....	35,064
			(Times (M).....	62,558
Troy, N. Y.....	70,304	200,184	Times-Record (E).....	34,451

EXHIBIT 57. PRESENTED BY THE HAWAII EQUAL RIGHTS COMMISSION

Territory of Hawaii, Bureau of the Tax Commissioner—Schedule of real property tax rates (per M) for counties—1934 to 1945

	Oahu	Maui	Hawaii	Kauai
1934.....	\$30.26	\$39.33	\$45.01	\$29.15
1935.....	29.94	41.06	47.58	36.02
1936.....	30.98	39.64	49.24	27.36
1937.....	31.01	38.43	45.87	31.82
1938.....	29.24	38.12	44.78	36.37
1939.....	30.88	36.84	44.21	35.96
1940.....	30.40	37.28	42.94	34.15
1941.....	29.10	37.18	42.70	36.36
1942.....	25.95	37.28	37.78	38.23
1943.....	28.08	36.68	40.55	38.06
1944.....	26.32	34.08	42.88	38.10
1945.....	27.26	34.04	43.60	37.76

[SEAL]

WM. BORTHWICK, *Tax Commissioner.*

HONOLULU, T. H., *January 11, 1946.*

EXHIBIT 58A-E. PRESENTED BY THE HAWAII EQUAL RIGHTS COMMISSION

INFORMATION REGARDING HEALTH CONDITIONS IN THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII

(Prepared for Congressional Committee on Advisability of Statehood for Hawaii, by the Territorial health department)

Below are tables of mortality rates from 1925 to 1945, inclusive, for the various major racial groups in Hawaii, including crude mortality rates, infant mortality rates, maternal mortality rates, and mortality rates from tuberculosis.

These show how the relative high rate among the Hawaiians in the population compares with rates for other racial groups. This information was requested by the congressional committee at the time the president of the board of health appeared before the committee.

In order to depict relative proportion of each of these racial groups in the Territory during the years for which death rates are given, there is also included official population estimates of the board of health for each of the years, including the break-down by the same major races. Figures for Puerto Ricans, Koreans, and all others are so small as to make the rates not statistically significant.

A. Crude mortality rates: Territory of Hawaii by race and United States registration area, 1925-45

	Rate per 1,000 population							
	United States	Territory of Hawaii	Race					
			Hawaiian	Part-Hawaiian	Caucasian	Chinese	Japanese	Filipino
1925	11.7	12.7	33.7	12.2	8.3	11.8	9.2	18.8
1926	12.1	12.4	30.1	14.9	8.9	12.9	9.6	14.4
1927	11.3	11.9	31.1	15.5	8.6	11.8	8.9	13.5
1928	12.0	11.7	30.3	14.8	8.6	13.6	8.8	12.0
1929	11.9	12.7	33.3	17.8	8.8	13.1	9.9	13.2
1930	11.3	10.8	28.2	16.1	7.3	12.0	8.3	10.9
1931	11.1	10.2	26.0	12.8	8.5	12.3	7.7	9.2
1932	10.9	9.8	23.8	13.6	8.7	12.1	7.2	8.5
1933	10.7	9.6	26.4	13.7	7.9	10.3	7.3	7.7
1934	11.1	9.7	27.3	14.8	7.6	10.9	7.2	8.2
1935	10.9	8.5	22.2	11.7	7.1	9.1	6.2	7.6
1936	11.6	8.6	21.5	11.3	7.3	10.4	6.8	7.0
1937	11.3	9.3	24.3	13.9	7.1	10.2	6.9	8.7
1938	10.6	8.0	21.6	10.0	6.9	7.9	6.0	7.3
1939	10.6	8.0	19.3	9.7	5.8	10.2	6.1	7.6
1940	10.8	7.2	20.4	8.0	6.0	9.4	5.7	5.7
1941	10.5	6.9	27.1	7.4	5.6	9.8	5.7	5.5
1942	10.3	7.0	27.4	7.2	5.8	9.3	5.7	5.6
1943	10.8	7.0	26.5	7.0	4.0	8.5	5.4	6.2
1944		7.4	28.1	5.8	4.1	9.4	5.4	7.0
1945		7.0	27.6	5.4	3.4	8.8	5.3	6.7

United States rates for calendar year. Territorial rates for fiscal year ending June 30.

B. Infant mortality rates: Territory of Hawaii by race and United States registration area, 1925-45

	Rate per 1,000 live births							
	United States	Terri- tory of Hawaii	Race					
			Hawai- ian	Part-Ha- waiian	Caucas- ian	Chinese	Japanese	Filipino
1925	71.7	103.6	258.5	76.2	67.2	56.2	59.8	287.4
1926	73.3	104.2	198.5	89.1	74.5	61.3	72.8	237.2
1927	64.6	96.0	237.2	108.4	69.9	52.8	55.6	226.3
1928	68.7	83.7	185.7	91.1	50.0	47.9	50.3	220.3
1929	67.6	101.8	202.3	119.4	57.0	64.8	66.7	244.5
1930	64.6	87.5	206.2	115.0	58.3	51.9	52.2	190.2
1931	61.6	76.0	199.5	82.7	40.8	54.5	49.7	158.2
1932	57.6	78.0	214.1	90.7	51.5	68.7	44.6	152.4
1933	58.1	73.7	191.5	106.8	50.0	55.8	42.1	121.3
1934	60.1	77.2	246.0	101.0	45.1	52.9	45.5	122.5
1935	55.7	64.5	151.2	81.7	39.6	34.8	41.2	110.8
1936	57.1	70.1	144.1	79.3	50.9	68.1	44.6	127.2
1937	54.4	74.3	201.2	90.2	41.6	40.6	52.0	124.2
1938	51.0	59.2	125.8	73.5	41.2	46.7	40.2	94.4
1939	48.0	57.9	114.5	64.7	39.2	34.8	42.8	99.3
1940	47.0	48.2	164.0	50.5	41.0	50.6	32.4	62.0
1941	45.3	43.1	108.1	57.3	36.0	34.7	28.6	55.8
1942	40.4	38.6	126.9	44.9	30.3	32.1	26.2	58.6
1943	40.4	40.2	120.7	49.9	32.3	21.2	29.3	55.0
1944		31.3	79.8	30.0	36.7	32.6	22.3	52.4
1945		30.3	100.3	33.6	29.1	26.7	24.2	29.5

United States rates for calendar year. Territorial rates for fiscal year ending June 30.

c. Maternal mortality rates: Territory of Hawaii by race and United States registration area, 1925-45

	Rate per 1,000 live births							
	United States	Territory of Hawaii	Race •					
			Hawaiian	Part-Hawaiian	Caucasian	Chinese	Japanese	Filipino
1925.....	6.5	5.0	17.0	4.0	4.3	2.4	4.4	7.2
1926.....	6.6	5.6	18.4	5.0	2.7	6.0	5.9	4.4
1927.....	6.5	6.2	19.0	5.1	7.5	5.1	5.9	2.4
1928.....	6.9	5.9	26.1	5.3	5.4	7.8	4.7	4.8
1929.....	7.0	7.1	20.2	6.2	6.1	8.6	5.4	9.9
1930.....	6.7	6.6	23.7	5.1	0.0	2.9	8.2	7.1
1931.....	6.6	6.3	20.5	4.9	4.8	7.2	5.7	7.7
1932.....	6.3	7.0	40.6	3.1	5.0	4.8	6.8	5.8
1933.....	6.2	5.6	18.6	5.2	1.4	0.0	7.6	2.9
1934.....	5.9	6.4	29.7	3.1	7.8	4.1	6.4	3.1
1935.....	5.8	4.8	15.9	3.5	7.8	5.7	5.8	4.1
1936.....	5.7	4.0	8.5	3.9	5.0	2.0	3.3	2.6
1937.....	4.9	4.8	24.3	3.3	2.3	6.2	4.1	4.3
1938.....	4.4	3.5	9.2	4.2	1.3	2.0	2.8	4.4
1939.....	4.0	3.8	12.0	4.1	3.3	2.2	2.2	4.5
1940.....	3.8	3.0	9.5	2.1	1.2	2.1	3.9	1.9
1941.....	3.2	2.0	0.0	0.4	3.8	2.0	2.2	1.9
1942.....	2.6	2.6	11.2	1.9	1.5	7.6	2.0	2.8
1943.....	2.5	2.3	21.6	0.7	0.7	3.3	1.5	6.4
1944.....		2.0	16.8	1.0	2.2	0.0	2.2	1.7
1945.....		1.6	17.4	1.2	0.0	1.3	2.2	0.8

United States rates for calendar year. Territorial rates for fiscal year ending June 30.

d. Death rates for tuberculosis (all forms): Territory of Hawaii by race and United States registration area, 1925-45

	Rate per 100,000 population							
	United States	Terri- tory of Hawaii	Race					
			Hawaiian	Part- Hawaiian	Cauca- sian	Chinese	Japanese	Filipino
1925	84.8	128.1	447.9	111.2	53.0	97.2	101.0	159.6
1926	85.5	114.4	350.7	127.0	32.0	96.1	92.3	164.8
1927	79.6	116.6	381.0	158.1	50.5	83.5	90.8	156.4
1928	78.3	124.3	384.1	126.4	42.0	158.3	104.1	137.2
1929	75.3	114.9	315.5	142.6	36.2	118.7	113.2	122.6
1930	71.1	107.3	328.4	175.5	31.6	108.2	86.4	146.4
1931	67.8	105.6	293.4	116.1	43.9	113.7	81.6	134.1
1932	62.5	95.3	233.1	104.0	22.1	95.3	86.2	136.8
1933	59.6	99.6	275.7	93.0	28.1	110.7	107.1	103.2
1934	56.7	89.0	273.9	118.6	26.2	74.2	69.8	143.5
1935	55.1	80.4	262.0	90.9	20.3	59.0	64.4	141.7
1936	55.9	75.3	175.5	108.7	23.6	95.0	64.2	110.9
1937	53.8	88.8	265.2	127.6	20.2	87.0	79.7	118.2
1938	49.1	69.3	234.4	52.5	19.1	64.2	64.3	119.0
1939	47.1	65.8	207.4	79.0	11.1	94.8	59.0	108.3
1940	45.9	63.2	161.0	69.0	18.3	62.7	56.4	118.5
1941	44.5	55.6	237.7	44.6	12.9	82.6	59.6	91.7
1942	43.1	56.8	296.2	44.8	17.9	57.9	60.5	89.6
1943	42.6	56.2	245.8	44.8	15.1	63.8	53.1	122.0
1944		57.6	286.7	46.5	11.9	104.3	51.4	133.8
1945		55.6	237.5	55.0	11.3	80.6	53.2	123.6

United States rates for calendar year. Territorial rates for fiscal year ending June 30. See crude rates.

*E. Population estimates: Territory of Hawaii by race and United States
registration area, 1925-45*

	United States	Territory of Hawaii	Hawaiian	Part- Hawaiian	Caucasian	Chinese	Japanese	Filipino
Fiscal year--								
1925	88,294,564	323,645	21,145	22,182	65,296	24,851	128,068	49,335
1926	90,400,590	328,444	21,054	23,436	65,794	25,111	129,901	50,145
1927	104,320,830	333,420	20,931	23,645	64,941	25,198	132,242	52,124
1928	113,636,160	348,767	20,720	25,984	68,428	25,310	134,600	60,078
1929	115,317,450	357,649	20,479	27,285	69,574	25,211	137,407	63,869
1930	116,544,946	371,250	20,275	28,596	76,221	25,318	140,078	66,627
1931	117,455,229	375,211	22,391	30,003	71,442	27,317	143,754	66,049
1932	118,903,899	380,507	22,230	31,515	73,365	27,235	146,189	65,515
1933	125,578,763	380,211	22,021	32,982	76,286	26,942	146,990	60,360
1934	126,373,773	378,948	21,796	34,419	76,391	26,989	148,024	56,700
1935	127,250,232	384,437	21,710	35,978	81,055	27,264	148,972	54,668
1936	128,053,180	393,277	21,594	37,608	88,193	27,495	149,886	53,550
1937	128,824,829	396,715	21,389	39,157	89,252	27,657	151,141	53,035
1938	129,824,939	411,485	21,268	40,867	99,360	28,380	153,539	52,810
1939	130,879,718	414,991	21,165	42,693	99,645	28,601	155,042	52,430
1940	131,970,224	426,654	21,063	44,228	108,055	28,809	156,849	52,148
1941	133,202,873	465,339	14,246	52,445	141,627	29,237	159,534	52,060
1942	134,664,924	474,351	13,431	54,689	148,646	29,429	161,112	50,661
1943	136,497,049	483,363	12,617	56,932	155,664	29,621	162,690	49,261
1944	-----	492,379	11,802	59,179	162,684	29,813	164,288	47,863
1945	-----	502,122	10,988	61,422	172,583	30,005	163,300	46,464

¹ Prior to 1941 many Part-Hawaiians were classified as Hawaiians.

JANUARY 11, 1946.

EXHIBIT 59. PRESENTED BY THE HAWAII EQUAL RIGHTS COMMISSION

**APPARENT CIVILIAN CONSUMPTION OF FLUID MILK AND CREAM—POUNDS PER
CAPITA OF URBAN POPULATION FOR BOTH CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES AND
HAWAII**

(Prepared by Agricultural Extension Service, University of Hawaii, U. S. Department of Agriculture
cooperating)

	1930	1940	1943	1944
Continental United States ¹ -----	345	330	403	423
Hawaii ² -----	202	219	273	275

**APPARENT CIVILIAN CONSUMPTION OF CONDENSED AND EVAPORATED MILK—
POUNDS PER CAPITA OF TOTAL POPULATION**

Continental United States-----	12.1	17.7		
Hawaii-----	19.3	34.5		

Territorial population			Territorial fluid-milk production		Shipments of condensed and evapo- rated milk from conti- nental United States
Year	Total	In cities over 20,000	Year	Pounds	
1930 ³ -----	368,336	156,500	1929 ¹ -----	31,583,053	7,093,689
1940 ³ -----	423,330	202,679	1939 ¹ -----	44,357,381	14,609,453
1943 ⁴ -----		236,005	1943 ² -----	64,500,000	-----
1944 ⁴ -----		242,596	1944 ² -----	66,650,000	-----

¹ U. S. Department of Agriculture agricultural statistics separates and food situation reports, Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

² Agricultural Extension Service, Economics Section, estimates.

³ Census Reports, 1940 (gallons converted to pounds).

⁴ Board of health estimates.

Remarks: In the sample years covered in above tables per capita fluid-milk consumption indexes in the Territory were from 114 to 148 pounds per capita less than in the continental United States. Per capita consumption of condensed and evaporated milk was slightly higher in the Territory than in the continental United States.

EXHIBIT 60. PRESENTED BY THE HAWAII EQUAL RIGHTS COMMISSION

CORRESPONDENCE OF CHARLES F. LOOMIS, HEAD OF MORALE SECTION, OFFICE OF MILITARY GOVERNOR, WITH ARMY G-2 AND POLICE DEPARTMENT, CONCERNING RUMORS OF SABOTAGE BY JAPANESE

(See also exhibit 67 and statement 17 (p. 599) relating to the same subject)

ORINDA, CALIF., April 30, 1943.

MR. CHARLES F. LOOMIS,
Honolulu, T. H.

DEAR MR. LOOMIS: Recently the following statements have been made in southern California and it is important that we be able to deny them, if they are false or partly so:

1. The movie, Air Force, states that on December 7 Japanese trucks in Honolulu deliberately put out of commission several American airplanes.

2. On December 7 American machine gunners cleared Honolulu streets of Japanese.

3. All over Honolulu were signs which read, "Here a Japanese traitor was killed."

4. The Government has prevented the mainland from getting all the damaging facts as to Japanese sabotage, etc.

5. The Japanese military attacking force bombed Oahu on December 8 and 9, as well as on December 7, 1941.

6. One civilian from Honolulu told a Los Angeles clergyman that his truck had been used for about a week after December 7 for picking up dynamite planted by the Japanese traitors.

I know that the statements in the Tolan report and by Edgar Hoover and by Blake Clark have stated or implied the falsity of some of these statements, but I should appreciate your up-to-date reply.

Despite the execution of the American aviators and the statements made by General DeWitt to the House committee here, the tide is slowly moving in the right direction, I believe.

Faithfully yours,

GALEN M. FISHER.

HEADQUARTERS HAWAIIAN DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT CHIEF OF STAFF FOR MILITARY INTELLIGENCE,
Fort Shafter, T. H., May 17, 1943.

MR. CHARLES F. LOOMIS,
Honolulu, T. H.

DEAR MR. LOOMIS: I was surprised to learn that some of the many island rumors about the Hawaiian Islands during the first few days of the war are still prevalent on the mainland. They have been repeatedly denied by all authorities.

In connection with the six statements that Mr. Fisher enumerated in a letter to you, it can be positively stated that all are untrue. It is hardly worth while to refute them individually but it might be of interest for you to know that the movie, Air Force, was censored and the scenes about the misuse of the Japanese trucks and the Japanese snipers on Maui were deleted before the picture was permitted to be shown in Hawaii.

Having been in charge of military intelligence activities since June 1941, I am in position to know what has happened. There have been no known acts of sabotage, espionage, or fifth column activities committed by the Japanese in Hawaii either on or subsequent to December 7, 1941.

Sincerely yours,

KENDALL J. FIELDER,
Colonel, G. S. C., A. C. of S., G-2.

POLICE DEPARTMENT,
CITY AND COUNTY OF HONOLULU,
Honolulu, T. H., May 12, 1943.

Memo to Mr. Charles F. Loomis.

Relative to the letter of Mr. Galen M. Fisher, addressed to you under date of April 30, I wish to comment with reference to the six statements which he submitted, as follows:

1. The statement that Japanese trucks in Honolulu deliberately put out of commission several American airplanes is an absolute lie. The Military and Naval Intelligence Services and the FBI can verify that there were no Japanese trucks on any airfield, nor did any such trucks do any damage in Honolulu on December 7.

2. There was no congregation of any crowds, and the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps was not called on to preserve order in the city. No American machine gunners cleared Honolulu streets of any Japanese, before, on, or after December 7.

3. The statement that all over Honolulu had signs which read, "Here a Japanese traitor was killed," is another absolute lie.

4. There was not one act of sabotage attempted by any Japanese or any other person during December 7 or thereafter.

5. The Japanese bombed Oahu twice: on December 7, 1941, and sometime during the latter part of 1942, when four bombs were dropped in the hills back of the city.

6. There was no dynamite planted by any Japanese or anyone else in or about Honolulu in December; and no civilian ever used a truck to pick up any dynamite.

While no acts of sabotage were committed, the Japanese did maintain an excellent system of espionage.

W. A. GABRIELSON, *Chief of Police.*

EXHIBIT 62B. PRESENTED BY OREN E. LONG

WAR RECORD OF THE SCHOOLS

AN OPEN LETTER

(By General Emmons)

United States Army authorities are most grateful for and appreciative of the kindness and hospitality shown their people by the civilian population during this emergency period.

The recent evacuation of dependents of Army personnel from the various Army posts to schools and to private homes in Honolulu was another outstanding example of the fine spirit of service and helpfulness that always comes to the fore in time of emergency.

With practically no notice, many hundreds of the dependents of officers and enlisted men had to get together their necessary personal belongings and clothing, pack hurriedly, and where their own transportation was not available, get to centers where busses provided by the Honolulu Rapid Transit Co. could take them to Honolulu.

Mothers of small children and with young babies had to see that the immediate needs of their children were provided for, that they had sufficient warm clothing, at least a small quantity of prepared food, and in some cases the necessary utensils for the preparation of such food. On the whole, the evacuation was made in an orderly manner and with the minimum of confusion.

In the meantime, in Honolulu, schools were being made ready to receive the evacuees, school staffs were being organized, and arrangements were hurriedly but systematically made to house and feed them. And in addition, hundreds of private homes were being thrown open and made available to care for the needs of these people who were having to flee from their own homes on posts.

It was at this time that the kindness of the people of Hawaii was most evident. It is known that in many cases people with slender means, with facilities that under formal circumstances were considered no more than adequate for their own needs, generously and hospitably opened their homes to strangers, shared with

them the best they had, looked after their needs, and did everything possible to make their guests comfortable and cheerful.

In many instances the members of the staffs of the schools to which evacuees were first received, while giving freely of their time to look after and care for those in the school, opened their homes, especially to women with small children, and did everything within their power and means to assist in adding to their comfort.

Such genuine and spontaneous kindness and helpfulness is not to be passed by without due acknowledgment by the Army authorities. It is not possible to thank every individual personally, but Army authorities are cognizant of the fact that such kindly assistance in this time of need and anxiety not only gave relief, comfort, and a feeling of security to those who were so generously and graciously given aid by members of the civilian community, but the whole morale of the Army, of husbands and fathers at their posts of duty in the field, has been strengthened thereby.

The men knew that their dependents were in safe hands and were being cared for. It was a magnificent example of people pulling together with the highest spirit of cooperation in a time of need for a common cause. This spirit of helpfulness and willingness to be of service is one of the high lights following the tragic events of a day that service people and civilians of Oahu alike will never forget.

DELOS C. EMMONS,
Lieutenant General, United States Army, Commanding.

STATEMENT BY DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION RELATING TO SCHOOL PARTICIPATION IN THE WAR

The department of public instruction, Territory of Hawaii, and the pupils and teachers of the schools made an outstanding contribution to the armed forces and to the community during the period of the war. In support of this statement, the following contributions and accomplishments are cited:

1. Gave up temporarily a total of 878 classrooms and other units for the use of the armed forces or related agencies associated with the war effort, including seven entire school plants which were transformed into hospital units.

2. Made available the equipment of 4 vocational schools with a total of 20 shops and the services of pupils and teachers in meeting urgent needs. These schools manufactured 8,000 machine-gun mounts, 4,500 land mines, 1,500 stretchers, repaired trucks and other equipment to an estimated production work value of \$250,000.

3. Contributed over 8,000,000 student-work hours to the production of sugar and pineapples, after these two crops had been declared essential food products, and sugar to be a basic ingredient in the manufacture of munitions of war. An average of 15,290 pupils each year of the war maintained home gardens; over 3,000,000 pounds of vegetables were raised by the children in school gardens.

4. Provided through the homemaking department food for civilians and members of the armed forces on special assignments; planned for emergency feeding in case of invasion; set up canteen service where the need was acute; and with the aid of over 10,000 school girls made such items as bunny masks, canvas stretcher covers, hospital jackets and gowns, evacuation knapsacks and sleeping bags, towels for hospitals, blankets and quilts, soldiers' sewing kits, garments for the Red Cross, and surgical dressings.

5. Sold war bonds and war stamps so successfully that Hawaii's schools have been rated by the War Finance Division of the United States Department of the Treasury as occupying second place among all States and Territories in per capita purchases of war bonds and stamps.

6. Teachers and high school students assisted in the first selective service registration and were largely responsible for the finger-printing and registering of the total civilian population of the Territory.

7. Maintained, in spite of interruptions and the tensions that resulted from the war, a program of instruction for the youth of this American community, with the usual emphasis upon basic learnings and special attention to the study of the institutions of the United States and the qualities and attitudes of good citizenship.

8. Made an outstanding contribution in the field of internal security. A community cannot be strong unless people are free from fear and from a sense of insecurity. Naturally, the people of Hawaii were terrified on December 7, 1941, and on succeeding days when they felt almost anything could happen. The experiences which children had had in the schools, and which they continued to have, made them feel that they belonged to this community and to the United States. Even the children of aliens knew that the teachers believed in them and in their homes. This gave them confidence. They carried this feeling into the home. It helped to make Hawaii strong. It is not too much to state that the commendable war record of Hawaii, at home and on the battle front, may be attributed largely to this sense of internal security which was fostered by the teachers in the public schools.

EXHIBIT 63B. PRESENTED BY JOHN H. WILSON

Summary of medical-care program, number of individuals authorized for treatment, and actual disbursements for fiscal years 1943-44 and 1944-45¹

[Presented to: The Congressional Committee for Statehood for Hawaii, by: John H. Wilson, director, department of public welfare, Territory of Hawaii. Submitted with statement 33]

	Individuals	Amount		Individuals	Amount
Medical care:			Burial:		
1943-44.....	5,370	\$13,264.87	1943-44.....	196	\$7,218.59
1944-45.....	5,920	14,598.77	1944-45.....	189	7,538.20
Hospitalization:			Total (2 fiscal years)...	42,344	905,804.30
1943-44.....	4,227	333,032.36			
1944-45.....	6,304	496,676.35			
Dental care:					
1943-44.....	7,614	12,638.60			
1944-45.....	12,524	20,836.56			

¹ See also exhibit 14i and exhibit j relating to other forms of public assistance.

EXHIBIT 63C. PRESENTED BY JOHN H. WILSON

WASHINGTON, D. C., January 9, 1946.

STATEMENT BY OSCAR M. POWELL, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, SOCIAL SECURITY BOARD

Presented to the Congressional Committee for Statehood for Hawaii, by John H. Wilson, director, department of public welfare, Territory of Hawaii. Submitted with statement 33

Subject: Public-assistance program in Territory of Hawaii.

In the past decade Hawaii, like many States, has made great progress in providing for its needy aged and blind persons and dependent children. Soon after the Social Security Act went into operation it established the program for old-age assistance in keeping with the requirements of the Social Security Act and began to receive Federal grants in aid in September 1936. In 1937 it established comparable programs for aid to the blind and aid to dependent children.

The establishment of these programs required the enactment of basic legislation and this the Hawaiian Legislature quickly provided. Since that time the legislature has amended the laws and today the Territory has liberal progressive legislation.

As of July 1, 1945, Hawaii was one of 12 States having no maximum in old-age assistance, one of 13 having no maximum in aid to the blind, one of 25 having no maximum in aid to dependent children. Thus the Territory has placed itself in a position to make payments to needy individuals commensurate with need and to give recognition to changes in living costs. During the war years, average payments under programs for the special types of public assistance increased substantially in Hawaii. From the end of 1940 until November 1945 the average

old-age assistance payment nearly doubled, while average payments for aid to dependent children and aid to the blind increased about two-thirds.

In the year 1944-45 Hawaii, out of Federal and Territorial funds, made assistance payments totaling \$954,000 for old-age assistance, aid to the blind, aid to dependent children, and general assistance. Of this amount, the Territory paid about 50 percent of old-age assistance and aid to the blind payments, 67 percent of aid to dependent children payments, and 100 percent of the general assistance payments. In November 1945, 1,453 aged persons received total payments of \$35,369, or an average of \$24.34 per recipient. For all States combined, the November average was \$30.69. In that same month recipients of aid to dependent children numbered 516 families and 1,572 children. Payments to these families totaled \$33,275 or an average of \$64.49 per family. The November average for all States was \$51.35. In Hawaii 60 blind persons received November payments averaging \$25.48 and totaling \$1,529. In all States providing this type of aid the November average was \$33.34. In November the general assistance program of Hawaii furnished aid amounting to \$19,779 to 612 cases with an average payment per case of \$32.32. In the United States as a whole the average per case under this program was \$31.70.

During the war the Territorial department of public welfare, similar to State departments, assumed additional activities in connection with the selective service program, and administered in behalf of the Federal Government in that area the programs for civilian war assistance and assistance and services to enemy aliens and others affected by restrictive governmental action.

EXHIBIT 64A. PRESENTED BY C. NILS TAVARES

(See statement No. 15)

TABLES OF CRIMINAL MATTERS DISPOSED OF BY COURTS, AND OF AVERAGE CRIME RATES

TABLE I.—*District courts of the Territory of Hawaii*

District	Cases disposed of during 1944	Cases pending on Nov. 30, 1945, unless otherwise indicated	District	Cases disposed of during 1944	Cases pending on Nov. 30, 1945, unless otherwise indicated
First circuit:			Third circuit:		
Honolulu.....	57,070	119	South Hilo and Puna...	2,290	2
Ewa.....	1,422	10	North Hilo and Hama-		
Koolauloa.....	72	10	kua.....	321	10
Waianae.....	67	10	North and South Koh-		
Wahiawa.....	1,360	10	ala.....	126	(¹)
Koolaupoko.....	938	5	North and South Kona..	119	0
Waialua.....	766	10	Kau.....	54	(¹)
Kalawao.....	2	0	Fifth circuit:		
Second circuit:			Lihue.....	171	0
Waialuku.....	598	0	Hanalei.....	5	0
Makawao.....	310	0	Kawathau.....	76	0
Lahaina.....	129	0	Waimea.....	142	2
Hana.....	38	10	Koloa.....	90	1
Molokai.....	86	0			
Lanai.....	64	0			

¹ As of Mar. 31, 1945.

² As of May 31, 1945.

³ As of Dec. 31, 1945.

⁴ As of Oct. 31, 1945.

⁵ No report from 1945 available.

TABLE II.—*District Court of Honolulu*

	Pending on Jan. 1	Total new cases filed during year	Average of new cases filed per day, excluding Sundays, or counting num- ber of court days at 313 per year	Pending on Dec. 31
1939.....	71	33, 179	106	164
1940.....	164	51, 514	164	202
1941.....	202	65, 707	209	401
1942.....	401	14, 676	46	66
1943.....	66	43, 713	139	104
1944.....	104	57, 079	182	114

TABLE III.—*Circuit courts of the Territory of Hawaii*

FIRST CIRCUIT

	Pending at beginning of year	New mat- ters filed during year	Total cases for year	Total cases disposed of	Pending at end of year ¹
1939.....	22	690	712	679	33
1940.....	33	483	516	510	6
1941.....	6	375	381	343	38
1942.....	38	129	167	107	60
1943.....	60	398	458	320	38
1944.....	38	565	603	500	103

SECOND CIRCUIT

1939.....	17	44	71	55	6
1940.....	6	93	99	69	30
1941.....	30	86	116	83	33
1942.....	33	14	47	25	22
1943.....	22	67	89	66	23
1944.....	23	48	71	43	28

THIRD AND FOURTH CIRCUITS (COMBINED INTO THE THIRD CIRCUIT IN 1943)

1939.....	4	56	60	57	3
1940.....	3	67	70	61	9
1941.....	9	55	64	44	20
1942.....	14	15	29	13	16
1943.....	16	60	76	50	26
1944.....	26	77	103	74	29

¹ Discrepancy between this figure and the 20 pending cases shown as of Dec. 31, 1941, probably due to fact that provost courts took over and purported to dispose of some of the pending cases after Dec. 8, 1941, when courts were closed by order of "military governor."

FIFTH CIRCUIT

1939.....	4	22	26	20	6
1940.....	6	43	49	44	5
1941.....	5	30	35	31	4
1942.....	4	5	9	5	4
1943.....	24	31	35	21	14
1944.....	14	33	47	31	16

² These figures are arbitrarily adjusted to reconcile totals, the report submitted having certain discrepancies. The total of the 2 figures, however, is correct, according to the report.

TABLE IV.—*Comparative crime rates—number of offenses known to the police per 100,000 inhabitants, January to June, inclusive, 1945*

Geographic division	Murder, nonnegligent manslaughter	Rank ¹	Robbery	Rank ¹	Aggravated assault	Rank ¹
New England.....	0.72	(10)	6.4	(9)	6.0	(10)
Middle Atlantic.....	1.19	(9)	10.0	(8)	15.1	(7)
East North Central.....	1.87	(7)	29.2	(5)	23.3	(5)
West North Central.....	1.23	(8)	13.3	(7)	11.9	(9)
South Atlantic ³	6.84	(2)	26.6	(4)	95.8	(1)
East South Central.....	7.88	(1)	30.7	(2)	73.4	(2)
West South Central.....	5.55	(3)	19.1	(6)	45.0	(3)
Mountain.....	2.11	(6)	25.1	(3)	18.8	(6)
Pacific.....	2.33	(4)	65.8	(1)	35.8	(4)
Territory of Hawaii.....	2.30	(5)	5.3	(10)	13.2	(8)

Geographic division	Burglary, breaking or entering	Rank ¹	Larceny, theft	Rank ¹	Auto theft	Rank ¹
New England.....	119.6	(8)	234.9	(9)	75.8	(8)
Middle Atlantic.....	² 99.1	(10)	² 198.4	(10)	68.8	(10)
East North Central.....	162.5	(6)	392.1	(6)	82.6	(6)
West North Central.....	118.7	(9)	318.3	(7)	76.5	(7)
South Atlantic ³	191.1	(5)	499.0	(4)	133.5	(3)
East South Central.....	216.9	(3)	410.5	(5)	132.6	(4)
West South Central.....	203.1	(4)	569.7	(3)	139.6	(5)
Mountain.....	221.3	(2)	654.9	(2)	127.5	(2)
Pacific.....	304.7	(1)	892.8	(1)	270.7	(1)
Territory of Hawaii.....	128.3	(7)	295.9	(8)	74.5	(9)

¹ In this column each region is ranked from highest to lowest crime rate; e. g., the highest is No. (1), the lowest, No. (10).

² The rates for burglary and larceny are based on the reports of 327 cities with a total population of 10,319,886.

³ Includes report of the District of Columbia.

NOTE.—The portion of the table on the rates for the several geographic divisions of the mainland United States is taken from table 7 of the 1945 Semiannual Bulletin (vol. XVI, No. 1) of the Uniform Crime Reports for the United States and Its Possessions, issued by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, in which rates are based on the 1940 decennial census.

EXHIBIT 65A. PRESENTED BY THE HAWAII EQUAL RIGHTS COMMISSION

ARMY COMMENDATIONS OF THE WAR RECORD OF THE PEOPLE OF HAWAII

(See also exhibit 62b)

RICHARDSON THANKS TERRITORY OF HAWAII FOR AID DURING WAR

(Article published in the Honolulu Advertiser, September 3, 1945)

ARMY HEADQUARTERS, MIDDLE PACIFIC, FORT SHAFTER, T. H.—Lt. Gen. Robert C. Richardson, Jr., commanding Army forces in the Middle Pacific, today thanked the people of the Territory of Hawaii for their part in the war, in the following statement:

"This is an appropriate time to express admiration of, and gratitude for, the manner in which the people of the Territory of Hawaii have supported the Army during the war.

"Military necessity required the imposition on the Territory of restrictions, such as the curfew and censorship of civilian communications, that the people of the mainland were not called upon to undergo. These restrictions, as well as the general civilian hardships of war, were accepted in a splendid spirit of co-operation.

"For many months, Hawaii was America's last outpost in the Pacific, its people under constant threat of attack as fierce as the onslaught which opened the war on December 7, 1941. Yet the people never faltered. Patiently, courageously they went about their tasks, supporting the armed forces by every means

in their power—doing war production work, buying war bonds, donating blood, providing comforts for those in service.

"Even more, they gave their sons and daughters to the services, in which enviable records were established. In many homes today, the joy that peace has come is saddened by the memory that a son or brother will not return, because he paid the full price of freedom on some Pacific island or European hilltop.

"I am therefore, very deeply grateful to the people of Hawaii for their unfailing support of the Army and of me as their commander in the discharge of my responsibilities. It is both a duty and a pleasure to make public acknowledgment of the gratitude which I feel."

EXHIBIT 65B. PRESENTED BY THE HAWAII EQUAL RIGHTS COMMISSION

(Public relations office, G-2, Central Pacific Base Command, APO 956, care of postmaster, San Francisco)

FINAL REVISED TEXT OF THE ADDRESS BY LT. GEN. ROBERT C. RICHARDSON, JR., COMMANDING GENERAL, UNITED STATES ARMY FORCES, MIDDLE PACIFIC, TO REGIMENTS OF THE ORGANIZED DEFENSE VOLUNTEERS OF THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII AT HONOLULU STADIUM ON JULY 4, 1945

This is a historic day, not only because some 10,000 residents of the Territory of Hawaii step out of the volunteer ranks, but because the enemy has been driven back to the shores of his own homeland and America has been made secure against his evil designs. None of us working alone could have accomplished this superhuman task, but all of us working together have performed the miracle.

It was a natural thing that volunteer defense units should have been organized in those dark days of December 1941, in order that you might help repel the enemy, should he dare to invade your cities and towns and the green countryside of Hawaii. Your organizations were born of the high purpose to serve, and you have served well.

The foe, who boasted that he would devastate our land, was driven back, and it did not become necessary for you to fight on the soil of this island. For this we are thankful. But you, as few other American civilians, have known the fear of living in a group of islands once in the path of the aggressor. You have been associated closely with the Army from the days of the Hawaiian Department up to the present time, when the western boundary of this command extends all the way across the Pacific to the shores of Japan. Army forces in the Pacific Ocean areas have suffered more than 7,000 killed or missing in action. They are a noble part of the price already paid for your security and for the security of America. Although you are laying aside your duties in the Organized Defense Volunteers, I wish you to know that your fellow citizens owe you an immeasurable debt for your patriotic services. Germany and Japan did their utmost to erase Christian civilization from the earth. We must do our utmost to make certain that it doesn't happen again. Your responsibilities as defense volunteers are ended today; your responsibilities as Americans are becoming more and more important with each passing day.

Time will not permit my mentioning each of you by name, but as I call the roll of regiments comprising the Organized Defense Volunteers, together with the Women's Army Volunteer Corps, please feel that you have not only my personal thanks for your splendid services, but the appreciation of the Army and of the community:

Businessmen's Military Training Corps.

Hawaii Defense Volunteers.

Hawaiian Air Depot Volunteer Corps.

First and Second Regiments, Oahu Volunteer Infantry.

First and Second Regiments, Hawaii Rifles.

Maui Volunteer Infantry.

Kauai Volunteer Infantry.

Molokai-Lani Volunteer Infantry.

Women's Army Volunteer Corps.

The Army has been proud to have you serve with it, and I extend to you the thanks and the appreciation of the United States Army forces in the Pacific Ocean areas.

EXHIBIT 65C. PRESENTED BY THE HAWAII EQUAL RIGHTS COMMISSION

LT. GEN. DELOS C. EMMONS PAYS HIGH TRIBUTE TO HAWAII CITIZENS ON OCCASION OF TURNING OVER COMMAND TO LIEUTENANT GENERAL RICHARDSON

General Emmons' message of aloha to the people of Hawaii follows in full:

"People of Hawaii, 17 months have now passed since that fateful date in December 1941 when war came suddenly to our country in direct violation of the protestations of the attacker.

"On December 17, 1941, by direction of the President, I arrived and assumed command of the Hawaiian Department and became the military governor of the Territory. It is now with sincere regret that I announce my departure from Hawaii to another area, the location of which I may not as yet disclose.

"My tour of duty here has given me the privilege of leading troops of all arms and of associating on an intimate basis with many officers and men of the Navy and the Marine Corps. As the executive head of the government under martial rule, I have dealt with many hundreds of civilians of all classes.

"Viewing the past year and a half in retrospect, it is the most pleasant experience I have ever had. Many factors have contributed to that result, but mention may be made of only a few in particular.

"The officers and men of the Hawaiian Department are entitled to, and have, my sincere admiration and gratitude. They have given me their loyal support and untiring efforts, and their consistent cooperation. I know that by reason of their training, physical fitness, equipment, and fine leadership, they are ready to fight as ably and courageously as any similar group in our Army.

"The great naval installations on Oahu require the presence here of a large contingent of naval, Marine, and Coast Guard personnel. I desire publicly to express to Admiral Nimitz and to the splendid officers and men of the Navy and its allied services my thanks for their assistance and cooperation during the period of military rule in the Territory. Our sister service in this war, as always, is proving itself worthy of all the fine traditions peculiar to it.

"I cannot overlook, at this time of leave taking, the tremendous amount of work which has been done by the women of this community in the past 17 months. Many hundreds of women have done emergency work—oftentimes difficult and strenuous—to provide needed hospital facilities, office assistance, clerical work, and recreation for the members of the armed forces. These women have earned the gratitude of the men who have benefited by their generous and willing efforts.

"The task of building fortifications, air fields, roads, and military installations has been immense. We asked and received the services of thousands of men, including those essential to plantation operation, to do these jobs.

"Speed was one of the prime essentials in order to attain a reasonable military security for the islands at the earliest possible date. The civilian war workers have completed many of their projects ahead of schedule. They have contributed in very large degree to the security of the fortress of Hawaii, and to them I give my commendation and thanks.

"Those organizations which represent your business life—the civic, professional, and commercial life of the community—have come forward in this hour of peril in an outstanding manner. Volunteer units of several types have come into being. They are composed of men and women who have given their time and money in a profound effort to be of assistance should the military necessity arise.

"They received no pay but have been actuated solely by high patriotic motives, to train themselves to perform efficiently in an emergency. They are effective forces and are a credit to Hawaii and themselves.

"In giving you my aloha, may I say that you have conducted yourselves in this emergency in our country's life in a splendid fashion. For reasons of military and naval security, it became necessary that rigid rules of personal conduct should be made. I recognize, as you do, that the black-out, the curfew, the restriction of many persons from certain areas, and many other rules, were burdensome and inconvenient. However, you have demonstrated by your conduct your full realization of the necessity which prompted the action, and you have, therefore, contributed in large measure to the ultimate objective.

"My task was a difficult one in many ways. It would have been doubly so had it not been for the whole-hearted support and cooperation of former Governor Poindexter, Governor Stainback, and all of the Federal and civil officials and the public as a whole. The people of Hawaii have set an example for the Nation to-

follow. To them I express my deep appreciation for their confidence and the hope that I have not failed them.

"My successor is a distinguished officer of long and varied experience. He has been especially selected by reason of his outstanding qualifications to command this vital area, and I know that everyone will accord to him the same generous and friendly assistance which has been given me.

"Such success as I may have had here is the product of the combined and thorough efforts of the Army, the Navy, and the civilian population. All were determined to make Hawaii safe from aggression and to develop these islands as a major base for offensive operations against Japan.

"We have worked together in harmony and mutual understanding. The record of our accomplishments is now history but the role of Hawaii in the final crushing of Japanese imperialism and the Axis dream of world domination and the restoration of peace in the Pacific yet remain to be written.

"I wish for you all—soldier, sailor, marine, and civilian—the best of everything in life. May the time soon come when these delightful islands may once more enjoy a peaceful routine of life, undisturbed by the threat of aggression from a ruthless, lawless, and godless enemy."

NOTE.—This was printed both in the Honolulu Advertiser and the Honolulu Star-Bulletin on May 28, 1943.

EXHIBIT 65D. PRESENTED BY THE HAWAII EQUAL RIGHTS COMMISSION

HEADQUARTERS HAWAIIAN DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHEMICAL OFFICER,
Fort Shafter, T. H., February 2, 1942.

Subject: Commendation.

To: Colonel Theodore Wyman, Jr., department engineer.

1. The Chemical Warfare Service has in the past few days delivered to the various first-aid stations thousands of masks for issue to the public. These first-aid stations located throughout Oahu and under the supervision of Dr. Arnold of the Office of Civilian Defense have done a wonderful job of issuing these masks to the individuals. Back of the scene though and worthy of all the praise we can give them are the boys from McKinley and Farrington High Schools and their supervisors, Mr. Jackson MacArthur and Mr. Harold Yap. It was their job to inspect, repair, and disinfect these thousands of masks, a job that was hard and tedious and which put a great responsibility on them, but one which they shouldered with seriousness and determination.

2. I want to take this opportunity to express our sincere appreciation to them for their excellent work and to you and your department for furnishing us with such a fine group of helpers.

GEO. F. UNMACHT,
Colonel, C. W. S., Department Chemical Officer.

LETTER TRANSMITTING EXHIBITS 67A-N, PRESENTED BY ROY A. VITOUSEK

TERRITORIAL CENTRAL COMMITTEE,
REPUBLICAN PARTY OF HAWAII,
Honolulu 1, T. H., January 12, 1946.

Hon. HENRY D. LABCADE,

Chairman, Congressional Subcommittee Investigating Statehood.

DEAR SIR: At the time I testified before your committee, I was requested to submit information to the effect that there was no sabotage committed in Hawaii at the time of the attack by the Japanese.

I submit herewith for consideration by your committee the following:

1. Photostatic copy of pages 48 and 49 of House Report No. 2124, being Fourth Interim Report of Select Committee Investigating Defense Migration, showing letters from Henry L. Stimson, Frank Knox and James Rowe, Jr., Mr. Rowe being assistant to the Attorney General (exhibit 67A).

2. Affidavit of W. A. Gabrielson, chief of police (exhibit 67B).

3. Affidavit of Dewey O. Mookini, captain in the police department (exhibit 67C).

4. Affidavit of John A. Burns, captain in the police department (exhibit 67D).
 5. Affidavit of Edward J. Burns, assistant chief of police (exhibit 67E).
 6. Affidavit of Hung Chin Ching, member of the Honolulu Police Department (exhibit 67F).
 7. Affidavit of Sing Chang, member of the Honolulu Police Department (exhibit 67G).
 8. Affidavit of Stafford L. Austin, manager, Honolulu Plantation Co. Chairman of all rural districts on the island of Oahu under the Office of Civilian Defense (exhibit 67H).
 9. Affidavit of Hans L'Orange, manager, Oahu Sugar Co., Ltd. (exhibit 67I).
 10. Affidavit of Frederic C. Denison, Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association (exhibit 67J).
 11. Affidavit of J. D. Bond, manager of Ewa Plantation Co. (exhibit 67K).
 12. Affidavit of Robert Fricke, manager of Waianae Co. (exhibit 67L).
 13. Affidavit of John H. Midkiff, manager, Waialua Agricultural Co., Ltd. (exhibit 67M).
 14. Affidavit of James N. Orrick, manager, Plantation Co. (exhibit 67N).
- Very truly yours,

R. A. VITOUSEK,

Chairman, Territorial Central Committee, Republican Party of Hawaii.

EXHIBIT 67A. PRESENTED BY ROY A. VITOUSEK

PHOTOSTATIC COPY OF PAGES 48 AND 49 OF HOUSE REPORT No. 2124, BEING FOURTH INTERIM REPORT OF SELECT COMMITTEE INVESTIGATING DEFENSE MIGRATION, SHOWING LETTERS FROM HENRY L. STIMSON, FRANK KNOX, AND JAMES ROWE, JR.

(See also exhibit 60 and statement 17, p. 599, relating to the same subject.)

[Copy]

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, March 30, 1942.

Hon. JOHN H. TOLAN,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. TOLAN: Reference is made to your letter of March 19, 1942, requesting a statement regarding sabotage activities in Hawaii.

The War Department has received no information of sabotage committed by Japanese during the attack on Pearl Harbor.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY L. STIMSON,
Secretary of War.

[Copy]

THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,
Washington, March 24, 1942.

Hon. JOHN H. TOLAN,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Thank you for your note of March 19 concerning acts of sabotage committed by the Japanese on the attack on Pearl Harbor. As you know I flew out to Hawaii immediately after the attack, and I went over the entire situation.

There was very little, if any, sabotage by the Japanese residents of Oahu during the attack on Pearl Harbor. There was a considerable amount of evidence of subversive activity on the part of the Japanese prior to the attack. This consisted of providing the enemy with the most exact possible kind of information as an aid to them in locating their objectives, and also creating a great deal of confusion in the air following the attack by the use of radio sets which successfully prevented the commander in chief of the fleet from determining in what direction the attackers had withdrawn and in locating the position of the covering fleet including the carriers.

However, during the actual attack, as I said above, there was little to complain of in the way of sabotage, either before or during the attack. Personally,

I am gravely concerned about the situation in Oahu and have been urging repeatedly the removal of the Japanese element, if not to the mainland, to one of the other islands in the Hawaiian group, as a measure of safety. Since the primary responsibility of this rests on the Army, my efforts in this discussion are limited to recommendation.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK KNOX.

[Copy]

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, April 20, 1942.

HON. JOHN H. TOLAN,
*Committee Investigating National Defense Migration,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: Mr. Lamb of your staff has orally requested that your committee be given information relative to the question as to whether there has been any sabotage in Hawaii.

Mr. John Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, has advised me there was no sabotage committed there prior to December 7, on December 7, or subsequent to that time.

With reference to the Offices of Naval and Military Intelligence, I suggest that you make appropriate inquiry of those offices for the purpose of determining whether they have any knowledge of any such sabotage.

Very sincerely,

JAMES ROWE, JR.,
The Assistant to the Attorney General.

EXHIBIT 67B. PRESENTED BY ROY A. VITOUSEK

AFFIDAVIT OF W. A. GABRIELSON

TERRITORY OF HAWAII,
City and County of Honolulu, ss:

W. A. Gabrielson, being first duly sworn on oath, deposes and says:

That he was born in San Diego, Calif., on December 4, 1885; that he is a citizen of the United States of America and is of Norwegian-Holland-Dutch ancestry; that in the year 1908 he entered into police work in the city of San Diego; that he has been engaged continuously in police work from 1908 to the date hereof; that in 1932 he was requested to come to the Territory of Hawaii to reorganize the police department of the city and county of Honolulu and on August 9, 1932, he was appointed chief of police of said city and county; that affiant has served continuously as such chief of police to the date hereof; that as said chief of police he has been in charge of all personnel and equipment of the police department of said city and county from said August 9, 1932, to the date hereof; that on and prior to December 7, 1941, said police department contained a personnel of 325 police officers; that in July 1941 in view of the international situation 150 men were added to the police force as reserve officers; that since December 7, 1941, many additional men have joined the police force and said police force now consists of 524 full-time officers and 275 reserve officers (said reserve officers usually serving approximately 1 night in each 6); that the police officers are assigned to one of three watches, the first watch being from 11 o'clock at night to 7 o'clock in the morning, the second watch from 7 o'clock in the morning until 3 o'clock in the afternoon, and the third watch from 3 o'clock in the afternoon until 11 o'clock at night;

That said police department operates a two-way radio station known as KGPQ, operating on a frequency of 1,714 kilocycles and on a mobile frequency of 35,100 kilocycles; that said police force also consists of officers assigned to rural areas of the island of Oahu and that three other police radio stations are located on rural Oahu (KHAB at Kaneohe, KHAC at Pearl City and KHAA at Wahiawa); that calls and reports are sent in to the headquarters of said police force (located on the corner of Bethel and Merchant Streets in Honolulu aforesaid) and to the rural headquarters and are sent out to motor patrolmen over said radio stations; that calls are also received at said police headquarters by police-box telephones (located on telephone poles throughout the island of Oahu) and by

the general public over the regular telephonic system; that said headquarters keeps in touch with the outlying rural districts from time to time throughout the day by radio and also keeps in touch, by radiophone, with the police departments on the other islands of the Territory of Hawaii;

That on December 7 and the several days following the almost unanimous response of the people of Honolulu and on the island of Oahu, including citizens and aliens of Japanese ancestry, was to remain calm and obey promptly all orders concerning black-outs, staying off the streets, air-raid precautions, and other regulations issued because of the war; that there were instances in which lights were left burning through ignorance of the black-out restrictions or carelessness; that there were instances of shooting at night; that said police department to date has found no evidence that any of the shooting which took place was done by persons of Japanese ancestry; that commencing shortly after 8 o'clock on Sunday morning, December 7, 1941, a great number of reports and calls were received by said police headquarters by radio, police telephone, or regular telephone from police officers, military police, and the general public complaining of various activities of a general subversive character, such as fires, flares, parachute troops, alleged sabotage, signals, blinker lights, prowlers, photographers, and numerous other miscellaneous activities; that all of said reports, regardless of how fantastic they may have seemed, have been thoroughly investigated and checked by members of the police force; that no evidence has been found to date of any flares originating except from areas wherein troops and batteries were stationed; that to date, in the thorough investigation of all reports received by said department, no authenticated case of sabotage of any kind whatsoever or evidence of fifth-column activities on the part of alien Japanese or citizens of Japanese ancestry on the island of Oahu has been found;

That attached hereto as exhibit A and made a part hereof are excerpts taken at random from the log of reports received by the dispatch of said police department on December 7, 1941, and subsequent thereto; that said list is typical of the type of reports of subversive activities received and of the investigation thereof; that during the first week after said December 7 most reports were of parachutists, signal lights, operation of short-wave radios, and of "suspicious characters"; that during the next 2 weeks most reports were of prowlers and signal lights (prowlers, for the most part, turning out to be block wardens checking on lights); that since January 1, 1942, reports have considerably diminished and are largely confined to complaints of lights—not signal lights but simply windows, doors, etc., not sufficiently blacked out.

Further deponent sayeth not.

W. A. GABRIELSON.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 9th day of April 1942.

[SEAL]

D. S. C. LUI,

Notary Public, First Judicial Circuit, Territory of Hawaii.

My commission expires June 30, 1945.

EXHIBIT A. EXCERPTS FROM LOG OF REPORTS RECEIVED BY THE DISPATCH OF HONOLULU POLICE DEPARTMENT

DECEMBER 7, 1941

9:33 a. m.: A man reported to be running around with a knife at 1346 North King Street. Reported to be unfounded later.

9:44 a. m.: A mysterious man reported that there was a tent near his premises, 2840 Nuuanu. Turned out to be a luau tent.

10:58 a. m.: Green-colored car with three men and palm leaves loaded on car seen traveling on Ala Wai toward town, near Ohua Avenue. One man wearing white pants, with mustache, nationality unknown, demanded money from someone, threateningly, then drove off. Men notified to pick up car.

11:17 a. m.: Brede and Yamada reported case at Ohua on suspicious persons turned out to be that of vagrancy.

12:43 p. m.: Report received that someone was looting house at 764 Judd Street. Honan, Whitford, Izumi notified. Honan called back that the owner of the house was removing his personal belonging from his bomb-shattered home.

12:56 p. m.: A. Oda and H. Gay to Wailupe radio station and check on report about someone being shot.

12: 57 p. m. : Two provisional police guards believed to be shot at Wailupe, according to some Two-hundred and Ninety-eighth Infantry men. Detectives sent.
 1: 06 p. m. : A. Oda called and stated that the case at Wailupe radio station is unfounded.

1: 59 p. m. : An unknown person reported that a man told her to leave her lights burning all night. James Carroll sent. 781 Sunset Avenue.

2: 26 p. m. : James Carroll called and stated that no one called for an officer at 781 Sunset Avenue.

3: 46 p. m. : People acting suspiciously at 3008 Kalakaua Avenue. Eaton sent.

3: 58 p. m. : Eaton called back suspicious persons case on Kalakaua unfounded.

4: 50 p. m. : Fire reported at 4032 Kalaniana'ole Highway.

4: 52 p. m. : Nishida sent to 4032 Kalaniana'ole Highway to check on alleged fire.

4: 59 p. m. : Nishida called back no fire at 4032 Kalaniana'ole Highway.

5: 18 p. m. : Alleged fight at 2565 Lemon Road. G. Gonsalves sent. Family squabble only.

5: 42 p. m. : Someone loading things on car at 3415 Alohea Drive. G. Gonsalves.

5: 50 p. m. : Eaton reported back family loading belongings at 3115 Alohea.

6: 49 p. m. : Chief petty officer allegedly storing gasoline at 858 Tenth Avenue. M. Gonsalves sent.

7: 12 p. m. : G. Gonsalves called and stated that he caught a Japanese man who does not understand English.

8: 46 p. m. : American factors being entered; Honan detailed.

8: 53 p. m. : Short-wave radio in operation at Emerson and Spencer. Izumi sent.

8: 53 p. m. : Someone sending message over radio from 1609 Palama. H. Chong sent.

8: 55 p. m. : 1320 Eighth Avenue; short-wave radio; Nishida sent; searched house. Everything O. K.

8: 57 p. m. : Honan reported back American factors case unfounded.

9: 04 p. m. : Harper reported someone shooting sky rocket near Lewers and Kalia Road. Turned out to be antiaircraft guns.

9: 09 p. m. : Fire reported at Campbell and Duval. Nishida sent.

9: 13 p. m. : Howard Chong reported short-wave radio at Palama Street—haole man listening to mainland news.

9: 22 p. m. : Nishida called back; everything O. K. at Campbell and Duval; no fire.

9: 22 p. m. : Izumi called back no short-wave set at Emerson and Spencer.

10: 30 p. m. : Someone digging up road at Sixteenth and Keanu. Nishida sent. Nishida called back gas company digging road—gas leak.

DECEMBER 8, 1941

9: 46 a. m. : Parachutist reported at 2253 Pauoa. P. Chong sent.

10: 05 a. m. : P. Chong reported no parachutists in Pauoa.

10: 07 a. m. : Suspected Japanese man at 3515 East Manoa Road. P. Chong sent. No such address.

10: 58 a. m. : Place on King and McCully being looted—old fire. Nelson.

12: 52 p. m. : Unknown person reported that Japanese women were filling bags with dirt at 3138 East Manoa Road. J. Pokipala sent.

12: 58 p. m. : Ray Melim, 2711 Pulena Street, reported that two men were walking toward Punchbowl Street. J. Pokipala sent.

1: 03 p. m. : Message from KHAB: Two bombs dropped in Kalama. No serious damages. Called back at 1: 08 p. m. and stated that case is unfounded.

1: 03 p. m. : Unknown person reported hearing machine-gun fire on Nuuanu side of Alewa Heights. P. Chong sent.

1: 38 p. m. : Unknown person reported a suspicious Japanese boy, dressed in leather jacket and black shoes, in Kauluwela School carrying a package under his arm. P. Chong sent.

1: 49 p. m. : Unknown person reported that a woman was releasing carrier pigeons at 207 John Ena Road. W. Smith sent. No such address.

2: 36 p. m. : Unknown person reported that two boys were under a tree in Kuhio Park, with long sticks. W. Smith sent.

3: 08 p. m. : McKinley High School reported that they caught some saboteurs. P. Chong sent. Unfounded.

7: 13 p. m. : Information received at this time that Lieutenant Harland of Fort Ruger called in regards to the sentry firing at the house. He reports one

of the black-out wardens had fired at a light about two blocks away in order to turn off the light. Detective Cobb-Adams, who checked, notified to take up the matter with the M. P.'s.

8:19 p. m.: Officer Vierra reported that the light at the Kalihi dump was due to a passing locomotive.

8:25 p. m.: Sgt. Victor J. Bonin, First Battery, Twenty-seventh Infantry, reported that car A-5548, operated by Harry Afi who lives next door to Assistant Chief Hoopai, was punctured full of holes when ordered to stop by a sentry at Lime and Pumehana Streets. The driver is an employee of the Podmore Co. It was not known whether the driver had been shot.

8:28 p. m.: Mr. Dillingham reported someone shooting in rear of the polo stables. Car No. 30-B, Officer Holbron, detailed. Sergeant Ching reported that the sentry at Diamond Head firing; No. 30-B cancel.

8:41 p. m.: Lieutenant Gail of the shore patrol reported that an unknown party residing at 3857 Claudine Avenue, phone 753782, reported to his office that a party next door has a very powerful transmitter.

9:39 p. m.: The case at 3837 Claudine Avenue is nothing more than a miscellaneous public wherein the party was hooked up to a mainland station and causing statics.

9:55 p. m.: Relative to a previous call received that there were lights atop the Hawaiian Pine Building, antiaircraft guns were being placed there.

DECEMBER 9, 1941

1:18 a. m.: A man seen on telephone pole on Ninth between Pahoa and Kaimuki. Officer Samuel Leong detailed.

1:23 a. m.: Officer Luning to check Ala Moana Park on parachutists coming down. He checked and reported case unfounded.

1:25 a. m.: Officer Leong reports no one on pole on Ninth Avenue.

2:49 a. m.: A woman at 1220 Richards Lane reported a shooting; Officer E. Won detailed.

3:24 a. m.: Officer E. Won reported he contacted the woman, Mrs. Brown, at 1220 Richards Lane and she informed him that she heard shots coming from the vicinity of Fort Shafter. However, none at the time of check.

3:26 a. m.: Car No. 34 to 903 Kealaolu Avenue, suspicious character.

3:39 a. m.: Car No. 34 reported back that 903 Kealaolu Avenue is nothing more than a barking-dog case.

4:28 a. m.: Calling all cars—be on the lookout for a motorcycle rider last seen at 2032 South Beretania Street waking up people.

4:34 a. m.: All cars notified to apprehend motorcycle riders who are going about waking up people; arousing too much confusion.

4:40 a. m.: Report received from an unknown party that an oriental man seen at 2360 Coyne Street walking toward town, calling people to wake up.

4:42 a. m.: Cars Nos. 52 and 28 to 2400 block Coyne Street, as a motorcycle rider is waking people up.

4:45 a. m.: Mr. Morla, one of fire wardens, has been instructing men to wake up citizens. Cars notified to bring offenders into the station as no orders were issued by Cleghorn Robinson, chief, to that effect.

4:49 a. m.: Car No. 52 reports having two men picked up for going about waking people up. Car No. 28 cancel search.

4:56 a. m.: Officer Leong reported that complainant had informed him that the flickering lights were caused by the reflection of the light on a car parked in a yard, light striking car through tree leaves.

5:54 a. m.: Sergeant Barbosa just received a telephone call to the effect that three men that were in a group near Kalakaua and Saratoga were fired at and one man badly injured and taken to the hospital. The other two men treated at the emergency station at Seaside Avenue and Kalakaua Avenue. The two men less injured were alleged to have witnessed the incident. Detective Barrus detailed to the hospital and Ridge to the scene. This complaint was received from a Dr. M. H. Lichter.

6:30 a. m.: Detective Barrus reported that the injured man at the hospital was not serious; shot on the head when he attempted to retrieve hat which had been blown into De Russy grounds alongside Kalakaua Avenue. He stuck his head into the fence and got shot by the sentry. His two friends weren't injured at all.

6:33 a. m.: Officer Apoliana to the Palama district to check on smoke there. Later called back and reported Iwilei industrial smoke.

7:12 a. m.: Aerial being put up at 1418 Makiki Street. W. Sheather sent. Sheather called back, party putting back old aerial for receiving set.

7:57 a. m.: Japanese allegedly having meeting at 1742 Ahuula Street, Apoliana. Unfounded—evacuees.

1:20 p. m.: Men notified to check for Boy Scouts forcing people to take down their clothes line. No orders received to that effect.

1:36 p. m.: Fire warden at Olohana Street, Waikiki, allegedly spreading false rumors of air attack. This information is allegedly being spread from the Robert L. Stevenson School. Captain Mookini sent to check at school. Smith called back (1:40 p. m.) Gordon Palmer (fire warden) causing 6 other boys to spread this information. Captain Kennedy bringing in Palmer.

1:55 p. m.: Tall slender Portuguese boy spreading air raid rumors in vicinity of Farrington School.

2:50 p. m.: J. Cavaco to service station on the corner of Palolo and Waialae Avenues to check on truck No. 50-478; alleged to have been given 20 gallons of gas by attendants. J. Cavaco called in at 2:52 p. m.: Man has permit from Agricultural Extension Service as he has to transport essential farm and dairy products. No case.

3:12 p. m.: R. Nishida to Sixteenth Avenue above Waialae Avenue and toward Claudine, a Japanese man passing papers to Japanese families. Unfounded—man has proper identification from Major Disaster Cn.

7:09 p. m.: MP's reported that they had been informed by Colonel Craig's office that there was a man on a pole opposite 917 Gulick Avenue, Japanese Church, signaling with red, green, and white lights. Toomey sent.

7:29 p. m.: Toomey reported that the man on pole opposite 917 Gulick Avenue was a man from the Hawaiian Electric Co. checking on transformer.

8:07 p. m.: Kinney reported a sentry fired at a man who failed to stop when commanded to do so at the McDonald Hotel, no one hurt, sentry not there.

8:09 p. m.: Wessel reported army man fired at a bulb at 4800 Kahala Drive.

8:59 p. m.: Oda reported that the Army are firing machine gun across the bay at Portlock Avenue, residents complaining that shots flying overhead.

9:17 p. m.: Sergeant Ching requests men be careful when approaching the Hawaiian pine listening post as one of them took a shot at him.

11:21 p. m.: Oda see a complainant at 903 Kealaolu Avenue about a maid who left in the night, suspicious, may attempt to commit suicide.

11:48 p. m.: Oda reported that the maid from 903 Kealaolu Avenue had been located fast asleep at a neighbor's home.

DECEMBER 10, 1941

2:18 a. m.: Report received from a citizen that flares were seen near the hospital at the Kalihi dump. E. Won to check. Apoliana reported back at 2:21 that the flares were nothing but sparks from train.

2:35 a. m.: Mr. Walker contacted about the passing trains in Kalihi, shooting sparks from the engines, giving the citizens the impression they are rockets.

3:18 a. m.: Awana to check for a fire somewhere in the Kam Heights district.

3:22 a. m.: On the above fire, the MP's reported that it was in the Aiea Heights area; Pearl City police notified.

3:58 a. m.: The fire department also unable to locate the fire and trucks looking about. Pearl City also reported fire not located in Aiea Heights.

5:41 a. m.: Arnold to 4709 Farmers Road to check on noise coming from rooftop. Called back stated banana tree rubbing against house.

10:30 a. m.: MP reported a bunch of drunks at Borthwick's Parlor. B. Rahe sent. No drunks around according to Sergeant Nelson.

10:46 a. m. Mendonca to King and Peterson Lane; selling grocery to aliens through rear. Cancel call; unfounded.

12:32 p. m.: 2647 South King Street and 2343 Namau Street, fires being started. Cavaco, Pokipala to South King; Nelson to Namau.

12:38 p. m.: Cavaco called back 2647 South King Street fire unfounded. Cavaco requested to recheck thoroughly.

12:40 p. m.: Anderson to Kasahara Shoten, Sheridan Street—refused to sell to Naval Intelligence. Unfounded.

DECEMBER 11, 1941

12:35 a. m.: Malina to check at 1848-A Palolo Avenue, suspicious character. This is the third morning such a complaint has been received from this place. Just a case of jitters.

6:25 a. m.: W. Nord reported he checked on the Japanese family living in Kamakapili Lane, directly at the back of 1252 Nuuanu Street for the pigeons kept there and found nothing suspicious. Japanese family willing to turn over pigeons but was told to keep them.

3:14 p. m.: J. Duncan to Kinau Street, about the seventh or eighth house waikiki of Alapai Street, to check on a house with a large glass on the roof. Complainant believes that glass might reflect the moon's beams.

6:44 p. m.: Wessel to 1142 Nineteenth Avenue, to check on prowler. Flashlight reflection.

6:45 p. m.: Holbron to 1321 Koko Head Avenue, prowler. Only leaves making noise.

9:33 p. m.: Kealohanui reported an ROTC boy with a rifle at the Union Oil Co. took a shot at them. Instructed to arrest the youth and brought into the chief's office. Came into station 9:47 p. m. Straus checking. Boy said he was afraid.

9:48 p. m.: M. Gonsalves to 2633 Nahaku Place, J. L. Jones, man in house.

10:13 p. m.: G. Gonsalves to the banyan tree on Tusitala Street, man in white behind it for the last 20 minutes, catch him. Fire warden stationed there.

10:30 p. m.: M. Gonsalves reported the Nahaku Place case was a light from the water heater.

11:21 p. m.: Izumi to the Kapiolani Boulevard entrance of the Hawaiian Electric Co., contact guard who will show where a prowler is.

11:47 p. m.: Izumi reported the case at Hawaiian Electric Co. nothing more than an H. C. & D. truck with bright lights.

DECEMBER 12, 1941

1:43 a. m.: J. Braga, sent to check a broken window at Fair Department Store. Sergeant Kaanaana, reported later no broken windows.

11:53 a. m.: E. Todd to 1613 Ninth Avenue to check on guns in a Japanese home. Unfounded.

1:23 p. m.: 957 Auld Lane, a very vicious and mad individual who states that he will shoot anyone if his wishes are not complied to. Cavaco and Won sent.

1:27 p. m.: Captain Mookini said that Auld Lane case unfounded.

7:13 p. m.: Hawaiian Pine listening post reported a steamer at pier 32 with light on starboard side; watchman at pier 32, phone 5027, contacted who stated that repair work is being done by the five contractors on a naval ship.

7:44 p. m.: Hutchinson reports the army is at KGMB with orders to shoot out all lights.

9:25 p. m.: The MP's reported two shots from opposite the Oahu Ice Plant on Kapiolani Boulevard. Rice to check. Report by Sergeant Tettrow.

9:28 p. m.: Hutchinson to the Oahu Ice Co., see sentry; assist Rice. Sentry thought he saw someone and shot twice. No dice.

10:30 p. m.: H. Chong to the Hawaiian Pine gym on Dillingham Boulevard, meet an MP by the name of Smith who will show where a bright light is. Work of essential nature being done for the Navy.

DECEMBER 13, 1941

4:26 a. m.: F. Arnold sent to 3753 Manini Way to check on a prowler. Unfounded, Arnold reported at 4:49 a. m. that cover of the rubbish can cause of the noise in the rear of the place.

4:23 p. m.: H. Chong to vicinity of Japanese Crematory to check on a white flag with Japanese characters. Called back stating that the flag belonged to some Chinese society.

DECEMBER 16, 1941

12:19 a. m.: Kennedy to check 1163 Fort Street man reported that someone took a pot shot at him on the second floor from the Bishop Street side of the building.

12:44 a. m.: Kennedy reported that a watchman had thrown a little pebble at the window of building at 1163 Fort Street as the place had a little light on within.

DECEMBER 16, 1941

11:45 p. m.: D. Izuma to 1700 block Wilder Avenue—two guards acting suspiciously.

11:51 p. m.: S. Malina called in. Two guards were talking in front of the above address.

DECEMBER 17, 1941

9:42 a. m.: J. Lum called that owner of car B-5717 had been picking berries all morning at top of Alewa Drive.

DECEMBER 19, 1941

1:19 a. m.: Kennedy to rear of Washington Place shooting case. Reported to station by Lindsey.

1:29 a. m.: Kennedy reported a check with all and with the corporal of the guards revealed that no shots had been fired from the place.

4:16 a. m.: Sergeant Nelson to Iolani Palace to check shooting.

4:46 a. m.: Nelson reported that shooting had occurred at the Armory as the men were loading the gun.

DECEMBER 21, 1941

11:16 p. m.: H. Wingham to Ala Moana Yacht Basin and check on a mysterious shooting.

11:22 p. m.: Sergeant Gunderson to Ala Moana Yacht Basin—meet a complainant.

11:23 p. m.: H. Gay called in: The shot in above case came from somewhere inside Fort De Russy.

11:25 p. m.: Sergeant Gunderson also stop at 1774 Ala Moana Road for additional information on same case.

11:33 p. m.: L. Scott called in: Checked with a sentry but he does not know where shooting occurred.

11:48 p. m.: Sargeant Gunderson called in: Guard saw someone walking and fired a shot in the air.

EXHIBIT B

JANUARY 7, 1942.

To: W. A. Gabrielson, chief of police.

From: Captain D. O. Mookini, patrol division.

Subject: My activities on December 7, 1941, and thereafter, and the activities of the men under my command.

A little after 8 a. m., on Sunday morning, December 7, 1941, as I made my usual call at the police station, I was informed by Lt. Andrew Freitas that Pearl Harbor had been bombed. At the same time, Lt. Freitas was talking to Officer William Canteio of the police station at Pearl City by phone, and was informed that Pearl Harbor was actually being bombed. Lieutenant Freitas then asked that the men of the first watch be detained at the police station for further instructions. I told Lieutenant Freitas to tell Lieutenant Larsen to hold his first watch for further instructions, and that I was leaving the station to check the situation.

As I proceeded toward Dillingham Boulevard, I noted the time to be 8:22 a. m. The traffic on Dillingham Boulevard at the time was normal. I noticed Officer William Clark regulating traffic at the intersection of Middle and Dillingham Boulevard. The flow of traffic at this intersection was medium, by this I mean that there were about 20 to 30 cars passing by. There was no congestion in traffic.

Upon arriving at Damon Tract, I called back to the station by 2-way radio and asked that some men be detailed to Damon Tract, and also to the Hickam Field housing projects, to assist in evacuation. In a short while, Sgt. Arthur Gunderson, officers Theodore Swana, Sam Malina, Clarence Alapa, Samuel Leong, George Jones, and Thomas Aoki, arrived at the scene for duty. Sergeant Gunderson was instructed to have these men notify the residents in the area to leave their homes and to go to some other places for safety. By this time, the people were all excited. Families with cars began to pack up their belongings which were readily prepared for evacuation and drove away. People without cars were told to go to the main highway and to wait there for transportation. A big-hearted civilian stopped by and hailed at trucks and other vehicles that were not conveying anything, and asked the drivers to pick up these stranded people and to take them to town. It is unfortunate that I did not take down the name of this thoughtful civilian. I then left this gentleman who was doing this good work and proceeded toward Pearl Harbor.

I drove past the oil tanks along Kamehameha Highway and noticed that the battleships in Pearl Harbor were on fire. I drove my car over the rock pile on the side of the road and watched the Japanese planes that were dive-bombing at

the helpless battleships that were lying in the harbor. The ships were taking a punishment from these enemy planes. As guns roared around me, I saw two planes coming down in flames, and fall on the west lock side.

I then drove back toward town on Kamehameha Highway and as I passed Pearl Harbor spur, I noticed that the traffic there had picked up an awful lot. Passing the junction of Puuloa Road and Kamehameha Highway at about 9 a. m., I stationed Officer John Cavaco there to take care of traffic.

As I passed the intersection of Middle and Dillingham Boulevard I noticed that Officer Clark had his hands full, as the traffic there was very much congested. Cars were at a standstill. I then called station for two motorcycle officers, and at the same time notified the dispatch that I was making the office of Mannie's service station located at Middle and Dillingham Boulevard my temporary headquarters, telephone number as 87706. Arrangements were then made with the attendant there that I would be at the intersection in front of the police station called and asked for me. In the meantime several military policemen and Officers James Duncan and Victor Peroff arrived. We began to break up the traffic, so as to permit Army trucks and naval personnel to pass through without a hitch.

A few minutes later Officers Sing Chang, Thomas Aoki, and Hercules Lauriano arrived for duty. Lauriano was assigned midway between King and Kamehameha Highway, on Middle Street, and instructed to direct all civilian cars coming down Middle Street to take one line of traffic, so as to permit Army trucks carrying armaments and ammunition and Navy personnel to go through without a stop. We also stopped outsiders from going into the devastated and bombing area, as we noticed that sightseers were passing by at the same time as the defense workers were hindering the traffic. Prior to my arrival at this intersection Officer Clark was instructed by someone (name unknown) not to permit any defense workers to go through Kamehameha Highway to Pearl Harbor, but to reroute them mauka on Middle Street to King Street. He was carrying out this instruction, causing traffic at the intersection to become congested. Seeing this to be the cause of the congestion, I ordered all cars to proceed in the Ewa direction on Kam Highway. The traffic then returned to normal in a short period of 2 or 3 minutes.

The evacuees who were heading toward town also caused a congestion at Puuhale Road and Dillingham Boulevard for a period of about 5 or 6 minutes, until Officer Aoki was sent to direct traffic makai on Puuhale Road and let them find their own way out toward town. At about 9:30 a. m. I noticed the traffic running smoothly. Officer Clark, an extra police officer, and an MP were left at their posts to take care of traffic. The other officers were sent back to the station with instructions to stand by for further assignments. I remained at this intersection until about 9:30 a. m.

I then made another check on Damon Tract. I contacted Sergeant Gunderson, who was in charge of the men assigned on evacuation detail at Damon Tract. He stated that the Damon Tract area had already been evacuated.

I then instructed Sergeant Gunderson to divide Damon Tract into four separate areas, and to assign four men—each man to patrol one of these areas—and to see that nothing was removed from the homes and lots in each area, except by the property owners.

I then proceeded toward Pearl Harbor and noticed a civilian directing traffic at Pearl Harbor spur. This civilian was placed there by Sgt. Axel Nelson, as he knew how to regulate traffic. Sergeant Nelson was instructed to remove the man, which he did. I then passed the oil tanks, and going through the Aiea Road, traversed Red Hill Road, proceeding in the Kaimuki direction. Conditions at all of these places appeared normal.

I contacted Sgt. Henry Ho at the intersection of King and Middle Streets, and instructed him that if the men were hungry they may go for lunch by relieving one another. I then drove makai on Mokauea Street to Dillingham Boulevard and out toward Dillingham and Middle. The traffic was flowing fine. I then broadcasted to the station and asked that the chief be notified that conditions on the outskirts of town were all O. K. As conditions outside of Pearl Harbor were running smoothly, I returned to town.

At 11:30 a. m., I was traveling makai on Channel Street from Ala Moana Road when a bomb fell in back of my car, and made a direct hit on a car. As I turned my car around, I noticed some workmen from the interisland shop turning water on the damaged car. Accompanying me on this trick was Mr.

Harry Fredericks, reporter from the Honolulu Star-Bulletin. As we turned right on Ala Moana Road, another bomb fell on the Fort Armstrong garage. We checked same and found that everything was placed under control by the Army men and their fire wagon. We then turned back on Ala Moana Road, and as we passed the Honolulu Paper Co., a bomb fell on an automobile that was parked in front of the Honolulu Iron Works. We found the car wrecked. We then drove further on Ala Moana Road, when we noticed three Japanese planes fly over the U. S. S. *Taney*. Two ships that were in port fired at these three planes. The planes then turned away from the vicinity of the Hawaiian Electric Co.

I then brought Mr. Fredericks back to the station and reported to the chief that everything on the western front was well in hand. At 12:43 p. m., I heard police broadcast in regard to radio transmitter at 2310 Booth Road. The case was turned over to Officer Y. F. Lum, one of our radio technicians.

I checked the bomb that fell at Nuuanu and Kukui Streets and learned that 7 persons had been taken to the Emergency Hospital. Two officers, namely Ernest Moses and Isaac Holbron, were at the scene. I sent these two officers back to their beats and assigned one of the new men who had a riot gun, to guard the place.

At 2:09 p. m., I heard police broadcast in regard to parachutists seen in back of St. Louis Heights. Checking that area from Manoa Valley with my spotting scope, I saw 6 or 7 children (boys and girls) descending the Manoa side of the hill. Case was unfounded.

At 3:06 p. m., there was another call about parachutists, this time at Tantalus. In checking this case with the use of my spotting scope, I saw only dry-broken branches of an eucalyptus tree hanging in the air instead of parachutists. Case unfounded.

At 4 p. m., I returned to the station and noticed that everyone was helping themselves to Army helmets. I questioned the men at the basement as to what officer was keeping a record of the helmets issued, and Assistant Chief Hoopai informed me that Capt. Robert Kennedy was doing same.

While on my way back, I received a call that parachutists were seen in the rear of the last house on Alewa Heights. Sgt. Paul Brede, Sergeant Adolphson, and myself then headed for this place. Arriving there, Mr. Bevin, former University of Hawaii student, stated that a guard who was on the hill requested him that if he heard him fire two shots, he was to telephone the police and the headquarters at Fort Shafter and ask that reinforcements be sent. About 2 minutes later, two Army cruising cars arrived with machine guns. They dismounted, packed their machine guns with them, and took their position on the ridge of the hill where the first guard stood. No sooner than they had taken their positions, both machine guns opened fire. In between the bursts of the machine guns, one could hear the firing of Springfield rifles. This incident brought back to me the memories of the old World War. Another cruising car then arrived and the soldiers on this car took their position in back of the first firing line. Another burst of machine-gun fire was heard, and this time, a shot was heard from a distance. Another burst of machine-gun fire. Then everything went quiet. A messenger came running down to us with a message. As the corporal was not able to read the writing on the paper, he asked me to look at it. The message said, "Send message to headquarters that we saw a fellow with blue uniform and a bundle on his back." I then mentioned to the corporal that earlier that same morning, I had seen some of their own men comb the ridges from Kalihi Uka way, and hinted that those might have been the men upon whom they were firing. I also mentioned to the corporal that those men wore blue denim clothing and carried packs on their backs. The corporal then wrote a note and had a messenger bring it back to the lieutenant in charge of the men. In a short while, most of the men returned to their cruising cars and left. The lieutenant left a few men stationed at their posts. I left the scene and broadcasted to the station that the war scene had come to an end.

The residents of the Puunui District must have wondered what the shooting was all about, as the Department received several calls from them.

At 1:28 p. m., I checked on four Japanese men who were reported seen with red shields on their arms. The complainant directed me to the house where the Japanese boys went. Upon investigating this complaint, I learned that they were civilian defense workers who were telling people to evacuate the houses in that area as they were situated in a danger zone.

I left this place to patrol other areas. There were no occurrences of important cases, other than minor ones. Night driving was difficult as the lights could illuminate no more than 50 feet away.

On Monday, December 8, I went home at 12 o'clock midnight to have some sleep. I woke up at 5 a. m., Tuesday morning, December 9, and left for town at 5:40 a. m. Just as I reached the intersection of Beretania and Punchbowl Streets at about 5:45 a. m., I was involved in an automobile accident which disabled the use of my car.

EXHIBIT 67C. PRESENTED BY ROY A. VITOUSEK

AFFIDAVIT OF DEWEY O. MOOKINI

TERRITORY OF HAWAII,

City and County of Honolulu, ss:

Dewey O. Mookini, being first duly sworn on oath deposes and says: That he was born at North Kohala, T. H., on December 25, 1895; that he is a citizen of the United States of America and is of Hawaiian ancestry; that in the year 1925 he joined the police force of the city and county of Honolulu, T. H., and that he was thereafter promoted to various ranks within said police organization and in the year 1935 he was appointed to the position of captain and that since the year 1935 to the date hereof he has served in said forces as captain; that in the year 1935 he was put in charge of the patrol division of said force; which position he has held continuously to the date hereof; that it is affiant's duty as captain of the patrol division to be in charge of all police officers in said division including foot patrolmen, motor patrolmen, sergeants, and lieutenants; that said patrol division handles all patrolling throughout the city limits of Honolulu, the officers therein assigned to certain areas or beats and instructed to maintain peace and order, and to call for assistance if necessary, investigate complaints, etc.; that shortly after 8 o'clock on Sunday morning December 8, 1941 affiant made his usual call at the headquarters (known as the police station) of said police force and located on the corner of Merchant and Bethel Streets in Honolulu, said Territory; that he was informed at that time that Pearl Harbor had been bombed and that the island of Oahu (of which Honolulu is the capital city) was under attack.

That affiant immediately left instructions to officers on duty at the police station and departed at once for Pearl Harbor by way of Dillingham Boulevard; that affiant reached the intersection of Middle Street and Kamehameha Highway at about 8:30 o'clock; that said intersection is located approximately 2 or 3 miles from Pearl Harbor and marks the beginning of the open highway which extends and runs from Pearl Harbor to the city limits of Honolulu; that Middle Street connects said highway to military installations and the arsenal at Fort Shafter; that in proceeding along the highway from Middle Street toward Pearl Harbor one passes on the left or southerly side of the road a small residential district known as the Damon Tract, the John Rodgers Airport (the municipal airport), and a large housing area recently built for defense workers and personnel stationed at Hickam Field (Army airport); that on the right or northerly side of the road one passes cane fields for the most part until nearly at the entrance of Pearl Harbor at which time one passes a large residential district recently built for personnel stationed at Pearl Harbor; that immediately after passing the last residential areas on either side of the road one arrives at Hickam Field and Pearl Harbor; that a rough sketch of this general area is attached hereto as exhibit A.¹

That after reaching said intersection affiant noticed traffic on the main arterial (Kamehameha Highway) was light; that said Dillingham Boulevard runs from downtown Honolulu to Puuhale Road (about four blocks before reaching Middle Street) and is four lanes in width plus parking space at either curb; that the extension of Dillingham Boulevard from Puuhale Street to Pearl Harbor is known as Kamehameha Highway and is three lanes in width; that running parallel to said highway along the length of said Damon Tract and Hickam housing area and southerly of the railroad tracks (which also parallel said highway) there is another road approximately two and one-half lanes in width; that after reaching the intersection of Kamehameha Highway and Middle Street affiant sent in a call by radio for officers to assist in evacuating said Damon Tract and the housing areas and affiant then drove at a brisk rate along said highway

¹ Not printed. Available in files of Committee on the Territories.

toward Pearl Harbor and branched off at the Navy housing area and continued on to the Navy oil storage tanks; that affiant then turned around and returned to said intersection of Middle Street and Kamehameha Highway; that the time was then 9 o'clock and traffic had increased; that affiant thereupon sent in a call by radio for more officers to help control traffic; that within a short time several police officers arrived; that from about 9 o'clock on traffic became heavier, there being a steady stream of traffic from the housing areas and Damon Tract of evacuees and a still greater stream of traffic of Navy and Army personnel and civilian workers attempting to get to Pearl Harbor; that at the same time there were a great number of Army and Navy trucks and other vehicles, particularly from the Fort Shafter arsenal, attempting to reach Pearl Harbor; that certain police officers were detailed to enforce evacuation of the residential areas in the danger zone and to assist the evacuees therefrom and other officers were detailed to direct and control traffic; that from 9 o'clock on one lane of traffic was reserved for evacuees coming from Pearl Harbor and two lanes were reserved for cars proceeding to Pearl Harbor; that at such times that convoys of trucks from the Fort Shafter arsenal came down Middle Street all traffic proceeding along Dillingham Boulevard toward Middle Street and Pearl Harbor would be stopped in order that such trucks be given full right-of-way; that automobiles driven from town toward Pearl Harbor by wives and other family members of civilian workers and Army and Navy personnel were stopped at the intersection of Dillingham Boulevard and Middle Street and the occupants transferred to another vehicle and the wives or other family member of such persons were directed to proceed northerly on Middle Street and thence back to Honolulu thus removing a considerable number of surplus vehicles from the Pearl Harbor highway; and keeping women and children from the area under attack.

That all of said traffic moved at a brisk rate; that the only traffic accident seen by affiant or reported to affiant as occurring in said highway throughout the day was a minor scraping of fenders between two vehicles, one driven by a sailor and one by a marine; that at 9:40 o'clock affiant made another trip down the highway, checking the Damon Tract, and then on past Pearl Harbor to the town of Aiea, thence back to Honolulu by way of Red Hill and Fort Shafter and thence down Mokauea Street to Dillingham Boulevard and thence to Middle Street, the starting point; that traffic conditions along this circular route were smooth and affiant so notified police headquarters; that affiant then returned to Honolulu shortly thereafter to check conditions in town.

That because of his birth and lifetime residence in the Territory of Hawaii affiant has become familiar with the different racial types of inhabitants of said Territory; that affiant experiences no difficulty in distinguishing persons of Japanese ancestry from those of other ancestry; that affiant observed vehicles driven on the Pearl Harbor highway during December 7, 1941, by persons of Japanese ancestry, most of said vehicles being those driven by Japanese residents of the Damon Tract who were evacuating family members and belongings to Honolulu; that the drivers of Japanese ancestry drove their vehicles in no different fashion than all others on the road that day; that their vehicles moved along in the regular traffic stream and were not driven at unusually fast or unusually slow rates of speed or in any fashion other than dictated by police officers; that at no time during said day or any day subsequent, to the date hereof, either in this particular area or in other areas of Honolulu did affiant observe any signs whatsoever of any sabotage or subversive activities by citizens of Japanese or other racial ancestry or any acts by any persons tending to lead to confusion or panic or to block the highways.

That attached hereto as exhibit B is a full report made by affiant on January 7, 1942, and submitted by him to W. A. Gabrielson, chief of police of the city and county of Honolulu.

Further deponent sayeth not.

DEWEY O. MOOKINI.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 9th day of January 1942.

[SEAL]

D. S. C. LUT,

Notary Public, First Judicial Circuit, Territory of Hawaii.

My commission expires June 30, 1945.

EXHIBIT B

JANUARY 7, 1942.

To: W. A. Gabrielson, chief of police.

From: Capt. D. O. Mookini, patrol division.

Subject: My activities on December 7, 1941, and thereafter, and the activities of the men under my command.

A little after 8 a. m., on Sunday morning, December 7, 1941, as I made my usual call at the police station, I was informed by Lt. Andrew Freitas that Pearl Harbor had been bombed. At the same time, Lieutenant Freitas was talking to Officer William Centeio, of the police station at Pearl City, by phone, and was informed that Pearl Harbor was actually being bombed. Lieutenant Freitas then asked that the men of the first watch be detained at the police station for further instructions. I told Lieutenant Freitas to tell Lieutenant Larsen to hold his first watch for further instructions, and that I was leaving the station to check the situation.

As I proceeded toward Dillingham Boulevard, I noted the time to be 8:22 a. m. The traffic on Dillingham Boulevard at the time was normal. I noticed Officer William Clark regulating traffic at the intersection of Middle and Dillingham Boulevard. The flow of traffic at this intersection was medium, by this I mean that there were about 20 to 30 cars passing by. There was no congestion in traffic.

Upon arriving at Damon Tract, I called back to the station by two-way radio and asked that some men be detailed to Damon Tract, and also to the Hickam Field housing projects, to assist in evacuation. In a short while Sgt. Arthur Gunderson, Officers Theodore Swana, Sam Malina, Clarence Alapa, Samuel Leong, George Jones, and Tomas Aoki, arrived at the scene for duty. Sergeant Gunderson was instructed to have these men notify the residents in the area to leave their homes and to go to some other places for safety. By this time, the people were all excited. Families with cars began to pack up their belongings which were readily prepared for evacuation and drove away. People without cars were told to go to the main highway and to wait there for transportation. A big-hearted civilian stopped by and hailed at trucks and other vehicles that were not conveying anything, and asked the drivers to pick up these stranded people and to take them to town. It is unfortunate that I did not take down the name of this thoughtful civilian. I then left this gentleman who was doing this good work and proceeded toward Pearl Harbor.

I drove past the oil tanks along Kamehameha Highway and noticed that the battleships in Pearl Harbor were on fire. I drove my car over the rock pile on the side of the road and watched the Japanese planes that were dive-bombing at the helpless battleships that were lying in the harbor. The ships were taking a punishment from these enemy planes. As guns roared around me, I saw two planes coming down in flames, and fall on the West Lock side.

I then drove back toward town on Kamehameha Highway and as I passed Pearl Harbor spur, I noticed that the traffic there had picked up an awful lot. Passing the junction of Puuloa Road and Kamehameha Highway at about 9 a. m., I stationed Officer John Cavaco there to take care of traffic.

As I passed the intersection of Middle and Dillingham Boulevard, I noticed that Officer Clark had his hands full as the traffic there was very much congested. Cars were at a standstill. I then called station for two motorcycle officers, and at the same time notified the dispatch that I was making the office of Mannie's Service Station located at Middle and Dillingham Boulevard my temporary headquarters, telephone number as 87706. Arrangements were then made with the attendant there that I would be at the intersection in front of the police station called and asked for me. In the meantime, several military policemen and Officers James Duncan and Victor Peroff arrived. We began to break up the traffic, so as to permit Army trucks and naval personnel to pass through without a hitch.

A few minutes later, Officers Sing Chang, Thomas Aoki, and Hercules Lauriano arrived for duty. Lauriano was assigned midway between King and Kamehameha Highway, on Middle Street, and instructed to direct all civilian cars coming down Middle Street to take one line of traffic, so as to permit Army trucks carrying armaments and ammunition, and Navy personnel to go through without a stop. We also stopped outsiders from going into the devastated and bombing area, as we notice that sightseers were passing by at the same time as the defense workers, were hindering the traffic. Prior to my arrival at this intersection, Officer Clark was instructed by someone (name unknown) not to

permit any defense workers to go through Kamehameha Highway to Pearl Harbor, but to reroute them mauka on Middle Street to King Street. He was carrying out this instruction, causing traffic at the intersection to become congested. Seeing this to be the cause of the congestion, I ordered all cars to proceed in the Ewa direction on Kam Highway. The traffic then returned to normal in a short period of 2 or 3 minutes.

The avaques who were heading toward town also caused a congestion at Puuhale Road and Dillingham Boulevard for a period of about 5 or 6 minutes, until Officer Aoki was sent to direct traffic makai on Puuhale Road and let them find their own way out toward town. At about 9:30 a. m., I noticed the traffic running smoothly. Officer Clark, an extra police officer, and an MP, were left at their post to take care of traffic. The other officers were sent back to the station with instructions to stand by for further assignments. I remained at this intersection until about 9:30 a. m.

I then made another check on Damon Tract. I contacted Sergeant Gunderson, who was in charge of the men assigned on evacuation detail at Damon Tract. He stated that the Damon Tract area had already been evacuated. I then instructed Sergeant Gunderson to divide Damon Tract into four separate areas, and to assign four men—each man to patrol one of these areas and to see that nothing was removed from the homes and lots in each area, except by the property owners.

I then proceeded toward Pearl Harbor and noticed a civilian directing traffic at Pearl Harbor spur. This civilian was placed there by Sgt. Axel Nelson, as he knew how to regulate traffic. Sergeant Nelson was instructed to remove the man, which he did. I then passed the oil tanks, and going through the Aiea Road, traversed Red Hill Road, proceeding in the Kaimuki direction. Conditions at all of these places appeared normal.

I contacted Sgt. Henry Ho at the intersection of King and Middle Streets, and instructed him that if the men were hungry, they may go for lunch by relieving one another. I then drove makai on Mokauea Street to Dillingham Boulevard, and out toward Dillingham and Middle. The traffic was flowing fine. I then broadcasted to the station and asked that the chief be notified that conditions on the outskirts of town were all O. K. As conditions outside of Pearl Harbor were running smoothly, I returned to town.

At 11:30 a. m., I was traveling makai on Channel Street from Ala Moana Road when a bomb fell in back of my car, and made a direct hit on a car. As I turned my car around, I noticed some workmen from the Inter-Island shop turning water on the damaged car. Accompanying me on this trick was Mr. Harry Fredericks, reporter from the Honolulu Star-Bulletin. As we turned right on Ala Moana Road, another bomb fell on the Fort Armstrong garage. We checked same and found that everything was placed under control by the Army men and their fire wagon. We then turned back on Ala Moana Road and as we passed the Honolulu Paper Co., a bomb fell on an automobile that was parked in front of the Honolulu Iron Works. We found the car wrecked. We then drove further on Ala Moana Road, when we noticed three Japanese planes fly over the U. S. S. *Taney*. Two ships that were in port fired at these three planes. The planes then turned away from the vicinity of the Hawaiian Electric Co.

I then brought Mr. Fredericks back to the station and reported to the chief that everything on the western front was well in hand.

At 12:43 p. m., I heard police broadcast in regard to radio transmitter at 2310 Booth Road. The case was turned over to Officer Y. F. Lum, one of our radio technicians.

I checked the bomb that fell at Nuuanu and Kukui Streets and learned that 7 persons had been taken to the Emergency Hospital. Two officers, namely Ernest Moses and Isaac Holbron, were at the scene. I sent these two officers back to their beats and assigned one of the new men who had a riot gun, to guard the place.

At 2:09 p. m., I heard police broadcast in regard to parachutists seen in back of St. Louis Heights. Checking that area from Manoa Valley with my spotting scope, I saw six or seven children (boys and girls) descending the Manoa side of the hill. Case was unfounded.

At 3:06 p. m., there was another call about parachutists, this time at Tantalus. In checking this case with the use of my spotting scope, I saw only dry, broken branches of a eucalyptus tree hanging in the air instead of parachutists. Case unfounded.

At 4 p. m., I returned to the station and noticed that everyone was helping themselves to Army helmets. I questioned the men at the basement as to what

officer was keeping a record of the helmets issued, and Assistant Chief Hoopai informed me that Capt. Robert Kennedy was doing same.

While on my way back, I received a call that parachutists were seen in the rear of the last house on Alewa Heights. Sgt. Paul Brede, Sergeant Adolphson, and myself then headed for this place. Arriving there, Mr. Bevin, former University of Hawaii student, stated that a guard who was on the hill requested him that if he heard him fire two shots, he was to telephone the police and the headquarters at Fort Shafter and ask that reinforcements be sent. About 2 minutes later, two Army cruising cars arrived with machine guns. They dismounted, packed their machine guns with them, and took their position on the ridge of the hill where the first guard stood. No sooner than they had taken their positions, both machine guns opened fire. In between the bursts of the machine guns, one could hear the firing of Springfield rifles. This incident brought back to me the memories of the old World War. Another cruising car then arrived and the soldiers on this car took their position in back of the first firing line. Another burst of machine-gun fire was heard, and this time, a shot was heard from a distance. Another burst of machine gun fire. Then, everything went quiet. A messenger came running down to us with a message. As the corporal was not able to read the writing on the paper, he asked me to look at it. The message said, "Send message to headquarters that we saw a fellow with blue uniform and a bundle on his back." I then mentioned to the corporal that earlier that same morning, I had seen some of their own men comb the ridges from Kalihi Uka way, and hinted that those might have been the men upon whom they were firing. I also mentioned to the corporal that those men wore blue denim clothing and carried packs on their backs. The corporal then wrote a note and had a messenger bring it back to the lieutenant in charge of the men. In a short while, most of the men returned to their cruising cars and left. The lieutenant left a few men stationed at their posts. I left the scene and broadcasted to the station that the war scene had come to an end.

The residents of the Puunui district must have wondered what the shooting was all about, as the department received several calls from them.

At 1:28 p. m., I checked on four Japanese men who were reoprted seen with red shields on their arms. The complainant directed me to the house where the Japanese boys went. Upon investigating this complaint, I learned that they were civilian defense workers who were telling people to evacuate the houses in that area as they were situated in a danger zone.

I left this place to patrol other areas. There were no occurrences of important cases, other than minor ones. Night driving was difficult as the lights could illuminate no more than 50 feet away.

On Monday, December 8, I went home at 12 o'clock midnight to have some sleep. I woke up at 5 a. m., Tuesday morning, December 9, and left for town at 5:40 a. m. Just as I reached the intersection of Bretania and Punchbowl Streets at about 5:45 a. m., I was involved in an automobile accident which disabled the use of my car.

EXHIBIT 67D. PRESENTED BY ROY A. VITOUSEK

AFFIDAVIT OF JOHN ANTHONY BURNS

TERRITORY OF HAWAII,

City and County of Honolulu, ss:

John Anthony Burns, being first duly sworn on oath, deposes and says:

That he was born in Fort Assiniboine, Mont., on March 30, 1909; that he is a citizen of the United States of America; that he is of Irish descent on his mother's side and of Irish-German descent on his father's side; that he has lived on the island of Oahu, T. H., since 1913; that he entered police work in the city and county of Honolulu on April 1, 1934, and has been continuously engaged in police work in the city and county of Honolulu since that time; that in such police work he has served as a foot patrolman, motor patrolman, sergeant, detective—general and homicide—captain of the vice squad and lieutenant in charge of the espionage bureau; that he has been engaged in work of an investigative nature for the police department of the city and county of Honolulu since 1937; that he became the lieutenant in charge of espionage investigation for said police department on January 1, 1941, and has, in that capacity, worked with and for the Federal Bureau of Investigation; that since December 7, 1941, he has served

as liaison officer of the police department with contact office of the Office of Military Intelligence, G-2, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

That from and after November 28, 1941, until December 7 a daily investigation was made by the men under his charge throughout the community, particularly among Japanese people, both aliens and citizens, to discover any signs or information which would indicate the start of the war which was expected, and particularly anything which might pertain to an attack upon the Hawaiian Islands; that during such period no evidence of any kind was found indicating that any residents on Oahu of Japanese ancestry were engaged in any activity or had any knowledge relating to an impending attack;

That on December 7, 1941, from his home at Kalama he observed dive bombers attacking the Kaneohe Air Base; that he immediately called Mr. Robert Shivers, special agent in charge of the FBI, and was informed by him that Japan had attacked the Hawaiian Islands; that he was requested by Mr. Shivers to come into town to FBI headquarters by way of Kaneohe in order to note, if possible, the extent of damage visible at Kaneohe Air Base; that he arrived at FBI headquarters on the second floor of the Dillingham Building in Honolulu at 10:20 a. m.; that he has since that time assisted Mr. Shivers and Lieutenant Colonel Bicknell, assistant, A. C. of S., G-2, contact officer of the Hawaiian Department; that in this connection he has served as a liaison officer with these intelligence officers relative to local people and conditions;

That on December 7, 1941, on his way into town he drove 12½ miles over the Pali Road; that the Pali Road is a two-lane highway that rises steeply almost from sea level to 1,200 feet; that said road is constructed up the mountainside to the pass with many U-turns and sharp curves; that it is a road that could be easily blocked or made impassable; that on said drive over said road he observed no person of Japanese ancestry or any other person blocking said roadway; that he observed no person of Japanese ancestry driving on said road in a heedless and reckless manner; that he observed several persons whom he could identify as Mokapu defense workers driving at fast speeds and in a reckless manner; that United States Army guards, some of whom were citizens of Japanese ancestry, were stationed along said road; that they appeared to be on the alert and discharging their duty in a highly satisfactory manner;

That in the course of his duties since December 7 he has been called upon to cause the investigation of many reported cases of alleged sabotage and subversive activities reported by military personnel, police officers, and the general public, including citizens and aliens of Japanese ancestry; that these reports have consisted of reports of flares, signals, sniping at United States soldiers, parachute troops, unauthorized short-wave radio sending sets, collecting of guns and ammunition and other war materials by persons of Japanese ancestry, plotting of groups of persons of Japanese ancestry residing on Oahu for some action against the United States, and other miscellaneous activities of a subversive nature; that all investigated cases of flares were found to have originated from Army encampments; that investigation of reported signal lights disclosed that they resulted from the carelessness of persons other than those of Japanese ancestry; that every case of sniping investigated failed to substantiate the claim of sniping; investigation of reported parachute troops showed that the reports were unfounded; that to date no unauthorized short-wave sending set has been found; that reports of collections of arms and ammunition in the possession of persons of Japanese ancestry have been investigated and found false except in one instance where a junk dealer of Japanese ancestry was found to have buried some 10,000 rounds of .22 ammunition, and investigation of this case disclosed that mercenary reasons and fear prompted the action; that investigation has disclosed no evidence of plans for concerted or group action among persons of Japanese ancestry against the United States;

That both before and since the outbreak of war he has been assisted in his duties by persons of Japanese ancestry, both citizen and alien, who have reported to him persons of Japanese ancestry whose attitude is inimical to the United States and persons of Japanese ancestry an investigation of whose activities might disclose subversive activities; that reports of disaffection for the United States on the part of persons of Japanese ancestry have in some instances been authenticated and the persons reported detained;

That in the course of his duties since December 7 he has also assisted in directing general searches made by officers of the various intelligence agencies in the many locales in the city in which there is a concentration of citizens and aliens of Japanese ancestry; that said searches in such districts were complete

and thorough; that by way of illustration in one such search 132 men working on an 8-hour basis participated; that these searches did not result in finding which would indicate the presence of any plots for an uprising or concerted action for Japan on the part of residents on Oahu of Japanese ancestry, nor did said search result in the discovery of guns, except in isolated instances, or any quantity of contraband materials, except in the one instance heretofore referred to;

That to the knowledge of affiant in all the investigative work that he has done and participated in, there has not been either on or since December 7 any authenticated case of sabotage or any authenticated case of group activity on behalf of Japan on the part of persons of Japanese ancestry, citizen or alien, residing on the island of Oahu.

Further affiant sayeth not.

JOHN ANTHONY BURNS.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 10th day of April 1942.

[SEAL]

D. S. C. LIU,

Notary Public, First Judicial Circuit, Territory of Hawaii.

My commission expires June 30, 1945.

EXHIBIT 67E. PRESENTED BY ROY A. VITOUSEK

AFFIDAVIT OF EDWARD J. BURNS

TERRITORY OF HAWAII,

City and County of Honolulu, ss:

Edward Joseph Burns, being first duly sworn on oath, deposes and says:

That he was born in Fort Des Moines, Iowa, on July 12, 1911; that he is a citizen of the United States of America; that he is of Irish descent on his mother's side and of Irish-German descent on his father's side; that he has lived on the island of Oahu, T. H., since May 1913; that he joined the Honolulu police department in the city and county of Honolulu on November 16, 1936, and has since that time been continuously engaged in police work in the city and county of Honolulu; that in such service he has worked as a foot patrolman, patrolman clerk, detective, and acting lieutenant, and since December 7, 1941, as an assistant chief of police.

That on December 7, 1941, at about 8:40 a. m., from his residence at 3255 Pearl Harbor Road, the same being about 2 miles distant from Pearl Harbor, he did observe a dive bomber with a red and white insignia on the same, flying over his house toward Pearl Harbor, and did hear sounds of heavy detonations coming from that vicinity, and also saw heavy smoke clouds rising from that vicinity; that he did shortly thereafter contact the Honolulu police station, and was advised of the attack and ordered to report for duty.

That almost immediately thereafter, at approximately 8:55 a. m., he got in his car and proceeded to the station; that his route was opposite to that followed by traffic going to Pearl Harbor from the city of Honolulu; that it was on Kamehameha Highway and Dillingham Boulevard, the same being the main and most direct route to Pearl Harbor from the city; that very little traffic was proceeding in the same direction as he traveled; that traffic was very heavy going in the opposite direction, that is, toward Pearl Harbor, and it consisted principally of busses, cabs, and private vehicles, most of which contained Army and Navy personnel; that on the said drive to the police station in Honolulu, a distance of approximately 5 miles from his residence, he did not observe any person blocking or impeding the traffic proceeding thereon; that he did not observe any person driving in a heedless and reckless manner excepting the drivers of several cabs who were proceeding toward Pearl Harbor with United States Navy personnel in uniform in the cabs; that the drivers of these cabs were not persons of Japanese ancestry; and that he arrived at the station at about 9:10 a. m., 15 minutes after leaving his home.

Further the affiant sayeth not.

EDWARD JOSEPH BURNS,

Assistant Chief of Police, Honolulu Police Department.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 11th day of April, A. D. 1942.

[SEAL]

D. S. C. LIU,

Notary Public, First Judicial Circuit, Territory of Hawaii.

My commission expires June 30, 1945.

EXHIBIT 67F. PRESENTED BY ROY A. VITOUSEK

AFFIDAVIT OF HUNG CHIN CHING

TERRITORY OF HAWAII,

City and County of Honolulu, ss:

Hung Chin Ching, being first duly sworn on oath, deposes and says:

That he was born in Honolulu, T. H., on August 14, 1900; that he is a citizen of the United States of America and is of Chinese ancestry; that in the year 1932 he became a member of the police force of the city and county of Honolulu, said Territory; that he has been a member of said force continuously from the year 1932 to the date hereof and presently holds the rank of sergeant in said force; that shortly after 8 o'clock on the morning of December 7, 1941, he heard the police radio calling for all officers to report; that affiant thereupon reported for duty and patrolled various portions of the city limits of Honolulu; that at 12:30 o'clock in the afternoon Lunalilo School and several frame stores and dwellings in the McCully tract were set afire by bombs or antiaircraft shells; that affiant and other police officers and a member of the military police took charge of the area, directing traffic, assisting firemen, and directing removal of valuables from the houses, stores, and school; that several members of the American Legion also assisted; that the residents of the general area around the scene of the fires are predominantly of Japanese ancestry; that persons of Japanese ancestry, citizen and alien, proved of great assistance in removing furniture and valuables from homes and stores and particularly from the school; that an elderly Japanese lady, identified as a Mrs. Harada, was badly wounded or killed by the bombing attack.

That thereafter affiant patrolled about the city limits of Honolulu and in the Damon Tract, a residential district near Pearl Harbor, until midnight and again patrolled general areas on December 8 and 9 as well as subsequent thereto to the date hereof; that at no time has affiant observed any signs of sabotage or of subversive activities or of looting of homes by persons of Japanese ancestry or by anyone else, nor have any signs of sabotage or subversive activities or looting been reported to him, nor has affiant observed any persons of Japanese ancestry doing any acts calculated or tending to create confusion or public panic;

That affiant, because of his birth and lifetime residence in Hawaii and because of his Chinese ancestry, is familiar with the various racial types living in Hawaii and experiences no difficulty in distinguishing persons of Japanese ancestry from persons of other ancestry.

Further deponent sayeth not.

HUNG CHIN CHING.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 9th day of April 1942.

[SEAL]

D. S. C. LIU,

Notary Public, First Judicial Circuit, Territory of Hawaii.

My commission expires June 30, 1945.

EXHIBIT 67G. PRESENTED BY ROY A. VITOUSEK

AFFIDAVIT OF SING CHANG

Sing Chang, being first duly sworn on oath, deposes and says:

That he was born at Kekaha, Kauai, T. H., on August 12, 1911; that he is a citizen of the United States of America and is of Chinese ancestry; that in the year 1936 he became a member of the police force of the city and county of Honolulu of said Territory and has been a member of said force continuously since the year 1936 to the date hereof; that at 12:02 o'clock a. m., December 7, 1941, affiant went on duty patrolling about the city limits of said Honolulu; that at 8 o'clock a. m. affiant returned to police headquarters at the corner of Bethel and Merchant Streets in said Honolulu to type his report for the previous 8 hours and go off duty; that affiant was then notified to stand by for further orders; that shortly thereafter affiant was instructed, along with other police officers, to proceed to the Damon Tract, a residential district which is adjacent to the John Rodgers Municipal Airport and adjacent to residential areas reserved for defense workers and personnel of Hickam Field, all of said areas being located along the main highway running from Honolulu to Pearl Harbor and Hickam Field; that affiant, accompanied by another police officer, proceeded at once in

affiant's automobile to said Damon Tract and went from house to house informing the residents to pick up their valuables, lock their houses, and proceed to Honolulu; that many of said residents had no means of transportation and started for Honolulu on foot; that most of said residents, however, were ultimately picked up by other evacuees who had automobiles; that enemy planes were flying overhead at the time firing machine guns; that affiant's automobile was struck by machine gun bullets; that a few of the women residents of said Damon Tract became excited, but considering the circumstances the residents of said Damon Tract, on the whole, were calm and orderly and assisted each other; that persons of various racial extractions live in the Damon Tract including persons of Japanese ancestry; that said residents of Japanese ancestry acted no differently than residents of other ancestry and were neither more nor less excited than the others; that affiant observed no persons, of Japanese ancestry or otherwise, commit any acts of sabotage or of a subversive nature or attempt to loot any houses and no such acts were reported to him; that persons of Japanese ancestry driving vehicles from said Damon Tract to Honolulu drove their automobiles in no different fashion than other drivers and at no greater or slower speed than the others; that all vehicles moved in an orderly stream; that affiant saw no persons, of Japanese ancestry or otherwise, do any act which might lead to general public confusion or panic;

That affiant remained on duty at the Damon Tract until the tract was entirely evacuated; that affiant was then stationed at Fern Park adjacent to Hawaiian Ordnance Depot to control traffic on Middle Street and to keep the road open for Army and Navy trucks and other vehicles; that affiant was relieved at his post at 4 o'clock in the afternoon and that up to said time affiant saw no acts of a subversive nature committed by any persons, of Japanese ancestry or otherwise;

That affiant, because of his birth and lifetime residence in Hawaii and because of his own Chinese ancestry, is familiar with the various racial types living in Hawaii and experiences no difficulty in distinguishing persons of Japanese ancestry from persons of other ancestry.

Further deponent sayeth not.

SING CHANG, {

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 10th day of April 1942.

D. S. C. LIU,

Notary Public, First Judicial Circuit, Territory of Hawaii.

My commission expires June 30, 1945.

EXHIBIT 67H. PRESENTED BY ROY A. VITOUSEK

AFFIDAVIT OF STAFFORD L. AUSTIN

TERRITORY OF HAWAII,

City and County of Honolulu, ss:

Stafford L. Austin, being first duly sworn on oath, deposes and says:

That he was born in Hilo, Island of Hawaii, T. H., on August 15, 1896; that he is a citizen of the United States of America and is of Scotch-English ancestry; that in the year 1920 he entered the employ of Hilo Sugar Co.; that from 1920 to 1926 he served as an overseer and division overseer in said company; that from 1926 to 1932 he served as division overseer and head overseer with Honolulu Plantation Co.; that from 1932 to July 1939 he served as manager of Wailuku Sugar Co.; that in July 1939 he was appointed manager of Honolulu Plantation Co. and has served as manager of Honolulu Plantation Co. continuously from July 1939 to the date hereof; that said Honolulu Plantation Co. is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of California and all of the other foregoing companies are corporations organized and existing under the laws of the Territory of Hawaii and all of said corporations are engaged in the business of planting, cultivating, and harvesting sugarcane in said Territory and milling and selling the sugar and byproducts therefrom; that as manager of Honolulu Plantation Co. it is his duty to be, and he has become, thoroughly familiar with all phases of the work of said corporation and of the lands, fields, buildings, and equipment of said corporation;

That said corporation owns or leases approximately 6,000 acres of land of which approximately 4,750 acres are planted in sugarcane and the remainder is used for roads, ditches, buildings, athletic fields, waste, and pasture

lands, etc.; that the lands of said corporation are located on the island of Oahu, said Territory, approximately 7 miles from the city of Honolulu, approximately 10 miles from Schofield Barracks and are adjacent to the lands at Pearl Harbor used as a naval base by the United States Navy, and are also adjacent to Hickam Field, used as an air base by the United States Army; all as can be more fully noted from the map of Oahu attached hereto and made a part hereof (said corporation's lands being colored pink); that said corporation, on December 7, 1941, employed approximately 1,190 employees, of whom approximately 530 were Filipinos, 480 of Japanese ancestry, 105 Caucasians and 75 miscellaneous;

That prior to the outbreak of hostilities between Japan and the United States of America, affiant was appointed chairman of all rural districts on the island of Oahu under the Office of Civilian Defense, that Richard Penhallow (a citizen of English ancestry), assistant manager of said Honolulu Plantation Co., was appointed chairman of Rural District No. 8, in charge of the entire area embracing the lands of Honolulu Plantation Co. and environs; that as such chairman affiant and said Richard Penhallow had issued practice emergency calls from time to time to accustom the employees of said corporation to their defense duties; that on the night of December 7, 1941, said Richard Penhallow (a reserve officer) was called into service by the United States Army and Robert Johnson (a citizen of Scotch ancestry), factory superintendent of said Honolulu Plantation Co., is presently acting as chairman of said Rural District No. 8;

That at 7:55 o'clock on the morning of December 7, 1941, affiant heard and noticed unusual airplane activity over the vicinity of Pearl Harbor and realized shortly thereafter that such activity was hostile and that enemy planes were bombing Oahu objectives; that he thereupon issued an emergency call and ordered all employees of said corporation to assume their prearranged defense duties, which work was promptly carried out in a most orderly manner with no confusion; that certain defense workers were required to obtain trucks of said corporation and report at certain emergency posts, the trucks to be used for fire fighting, ambulance service, repairs to utility lines, demolition work, etc.; that four trucks were sent with crews to Pearl Harbor to assist the naval authorities, and various station wagons of said corporation were used for patrol duty, most of said station wagons containing one or more members of Army personnel as passengers; that all trucks or rolling stock of said corporation were accounted for on the morning of December 7, 1941, and no trucks or rolling stock of said corporation were used on that day except in line with civilian emergency defense; that various employees of Japanese ancestry were assigned to duty with said trucks and their work was done smoothly and efficiently and in no different fashion than the work performed by employees of other ancestry; that all of said trucks proceeded to and remained at their posts throughout the day and night of December 7, 1941, being manned by employee defense crews at all times.

That in assisting the Army personnel and in overseeing the civilian defense system in that general area, on December 7, 1941, affiant traveled about and observed traffic conditions in that general area (of the corporation's lands and environs); that various persons of Japanese ancestry were driving vehicles on the main highways which bisect said plantation lands; that all of said drivers of Japanese ancestry drove their vehicles in the normal and usual fashion and at the normal and usual rates of speed; that affiant did not see any drivers of Japanese ancestry driving vehicles in any unusual manner or at any unusually slow or unusually fast rate of speed or in a zigzag fashion or on the wrong side of the road, nor did he see any of such drivers park vehicles across the roads or do any act which might lead to confusion or place others in danger.

That at no time was affiant requested to investigate the lands of said corporation for indications that persons, presumably of Japanese ancestry, had burned or cut sugarcane or had otherwise created signs or symbols on or near the plantation lands in the form of arrows to guide Japanese planes toward military objectives; that since December 7, 1941, however, the usual activities of said corporation have been carried out including the usual work of irrigation, cultivation, harvesting, etc., under the direction of affiant and his immediate subordinates; that if any sugarcane on the plantation lands had been burned or cut in the form of arrows or other signs or symbols created upon the lands of the corporation or lands adjacent thereto such would have been immediately noticed by affiant or his subordinates; that affiant has not seen any signs of such activities nor has any such activities been reported to him by his subordinates.

That at about 8:30 o'clock on the morning of December 7, 1941, a Japanese airplane fell into a cane field about 2 miles north of the corporation's mill and burned a small area; that said fire was almost immediately extinguished by the corporation's fire-truck crew, which includes men of Japanese ancestry; that all members of said crew worked swiftly and diligently and without confusion in extinguishing said fire.

That during the night of December 7, 1941, and for about a week thereafter, there was sporadic firing by military detachments located on or near the lands of said corporation which was observed by affiant but affiant was unable to perceive any reason for such firing; that Army officers complained to affiant of being fired upon from ambush; that affiant and his civilian defense workers investigated said complaints but could find no basis therefor; that affiant believes that stray bullets from the afore-mentioned sporadic firing by military detachments were the cause of said complaints; that at nighttime, continuing for about a week after December 7, 1941, affiant observed red flares, apparently fired by Very signal pistols, along the edge of the corporation's lands and bordering upon the edge of the water of Pearl Harbor; that investigation was made by affiant as to the origin of said red flares but said investigation proved fruitless; that the area from which said flares emanated was, during said period, patrolled by personnel of the United States Army.

That at no time prior to or subsequent to or on December 7, 1941, has affiant observed any signs of sabotage or subversive activities or signals by "blinkers" and at no time prior to or subsequent to December 7, 1941, have any signs of sabotage or subversive activities or "blinker" signals been reported to affiant by any employee of Honolulu Plantation Co. or by anyone else.

That affiant, in his position as chairman of all rural defense, has sent approximately 2,000 men each day from December 7, 1941, to January 1, 1942, to various Army posts to do such work as directed by Army authorities; that said men performed such work digging gun emplacements, building roads and airfields, cutting brush and thickets, doing repair and construction work, etc.; that among said men are men of Japanese ancestry, some being citizens and some being aliens; that most of the more highly skilled carpenters, especially, are Japanese aliens; that all of said men have been accepted gratefully and without question by the Army authorities; that affiant has been told personally by the ranking officers of the United States Army in charge of the work being done by said men that said men have been of great assistance and have great cooperation, loyalty, and efficiency; that on January 1, 1942, the sending of men has been handled by the Hawaiian Sugar Planters Association, a cooperative organization formed by all sugar companies and plantations in the Territory of Hawaii, that on every day since January 1, 1942, up to the date hereof men have been sent to Army posts for this same type of work, although affiant does not know how many men have been sent on each day.

That affiant, because of his many years of residence in the Territory of Hawaii and because of his various positions on plantations in said Territory, has become and has been required to become familiar with the different racial types of inhabitants of said Territory and to know them by name and by racial extraction; and that affiant experiences no difficulty in distinguishing persons of Japanese ancestry from those of other ancestry.

Further deponent sayeth not.

STAFFORD L. AUSTIN.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 7th day of April 1942.

[SEAL]

J. I. B. GREIG,

Notary Public, First Judicial Circuit, Territory of Hawaii.

My commission expires June 30, 1945.

EXHIBIT 67I. PRESENTED BY ROY A. VITOUSEK

AFFIDAVIT OF HANS L'ORANGE

TERRITORY OF HAWAII,

City and County of Honolulu, ss:

Hans L'Orange, being first duly sworn on oath, deposes and says:

That he was born in Quincy, Fla., on February 15, 1892; that he is a citizen of the United States of America and is of Norwegian ancestry; that in the year 1911 he entered the employ of Oahu Sugar Co., Ltd., a corporation organized and

existing under the laws of the Territory of Hawaii and engaged in the business of planting, cultivating, and harvesting sugarcane on the island of Oahu, said Territory, and milling and selling the sugar and byproducts therefrom; that from 1911 to 1937 he served successively as overseer, division overseer, head overseer, and assistant manager of said corporation; that in 1937 he was appointed manager of said corporation; that he has served as manager of said corporation from 1937 continuously to the date hereof; that as such manager it is his duty to be, and he has become, thoroughly familiar with all phases of the work of said corporation and of the lands, fields, buildings, and equipment of said corporation.

That said corporation owns or leases approximately 14,000 acres of land, of which approximately 12,000 acres are planted in sugarcane and the remainder is used for roads, ditches, buildings, athletic fields, waste and pasture lands, etc.; that the lands of said corporation are located approximately 13 miles from the city of Honolulu, Oahu, T. H., and lie between and adjacent to Pearl Harbor on the southeast and Schofield Barracks on the northwest, as can be more fully noted from the map attached hereto and made a part hereof (said plantation lands being colored pink; that said corporation, on December 7, 1941, employed approximately 1,750 employees, of whom approximately 715 were Filipinos, 780 of Japanese ancestry, 155 Caucasian, and 100 miscellaneous;

That prior to the outbreak of hostilities between the United States of America and Japan, affiant was appointed chairman of rural district No. 7 of the Office of the Civilian Defense, in charge of the entire area embracing the lands of Oahu Sugar Co., Ltd., and other lands adjacent thereto; that among the lands so embraced is the town of Waipahu, having a population of approximately 11,000 inhabitants, of whom persons of Japanese ancestry are predominant; that as such chairman affiant had issued practice emergency calls from time to time to accustom the employees of said corporation and residents of Waipahu to their defense duties.

That at about 7:55 o'clock on the morning of December 7, 1941, affiant heard machine-gun fire and great airplane activity and shortly thereafter realized that such activity was hostile and that enemy planes were bombing Oahu objectives; that he thereupon issued an emergency call and ordered all employees of said corporation to assume their prearranged defense duties, which work was promptly carried out in a most orderly manner with no confusion; that certain defense workers are required to obtain trucks of said corporation and report at certain emergency posts, the trucks to be used for fire fighting, ambulance service, repairs to utility lines, demolition work, etc.; that some trucks were sent to Pearl Harbor and Hickam Field; that all trucks or rolling stock of said corporation were accounted for on the morning of December 7, 1941, and no trucks or rolling stock were used on that day except in line with civilian emergency defense; that various employees of Japanese ancestry were assigned to duty with said trucks and their work was done smoothly and efficiently and in no different fashion as the work performed by employees of other ancestry; that said trucks proceeded to their appointed posts and remained there throughout the day and night of December 7, 1941, being manned by employee defense-crews at all times.

That in assisting the Army personnel and in overseeing the civilian defense system in that general area, on December 7, 1941, affiant traveled about and observed traffic conditions in that general area (of the corporation's lands and environs); that various persons of Japanese ancestry were driving vehicles on the main highways which bisect said plantation lands; that all of said drivers of Japanese ancestry drove their vehicles in the normal and usual fashion and at the normal and usual rates of speed; that affiant did not see any drivers of Japanese ancestry driving vehicles in any unusual manner or at any unusually slow or unusually fast rate of speed or in a zigzag fashion or on the wrong side of the road, nor did he see any of such drivers park vehicles across the roads or do any act which might lead to confusion or place others in danger.

That on the night of December 7, 1941, affiant observed gun flashes and tracer bullets being fired from the ground around Pearl Harbor into the air; that considering the points from which said flashes and bullets emanated affiant unquestionably believes said flashes and bullets came from military detachments; that aside from the foregoing affiant has observed no flares or signal lights or fires or "blinkers" of any sort to the date hereof, nor has the existence of any flares, signal lights or fires or "blinkers" been reported to him by anyone; that on the night of December 7, 1941, rumors of flashlights emanating from the roof of a building reached affiant; that affiant promptly conducted an investigation of same which revealed nothing.

That at about 8:30 o'clock on the morning of December 7, 1941, a cane fire started along the water's edge of Pearl Harbor and burned about 8 acres of cane before it was extinguished; that affiant believes said fire was caused by the explosion of a bomb or antiaircraft shell; that at about 10:30 o'clock of said morning another cane fire started along Kunia Road about 3 miles northwest of the mill of said corporation and burned about 1 acre of cane before it was extinguished; that said fire doubtless caused by a power line which had been torn by an explosion or gunfire; that both of said fires were extinguished as quickly as possible by fire-fighting crews of said corporation, said crews having members of Japanese ancestry who worked as diligently and efficiently as those of other ancestry.

That during the day of December 7, 1941, Japanese planes fired upon camps and buildings of said Oahu Sugar Co. Ltd., and upon buildings in the town of Waipahu; that the mill of said corporation was riddled by machine-gun bullets; that one Japanese youth age 20 years or thereabouts was killed, that 37 other residents were injured; that wounded from Pearl Harbor were brought to the hospital of said corporation at Waipahu; that despite these general conditions, the residents of the Waipahu district (rural district No. 7) were as calm and free from confusion as affiant could have wished; that hundreds of evacuees from more dangerous regions near and at Pearl Harbor were cared for; that all members of affiant's Civilian Defense Corps, regardless of their ancestry, and all residents of that area, Japanese and otherwise, were very cooperative and filled their positions to affiant's satisfaction and were found to be willing and anxious to render assistance; that throughout the present emergency the Japanese community in said area has been active in Red Cross work and generous in donations of time and money; that no violations to affiant's knowledge of any order of the military governor concerning black-outs or any other rule have been violated to the date hereof by residents of said area.

That at no time prior to, subsequent to, or on December 7, 1941, has affiant observed any signs of sabotage or subversive activities by persons of Japanese ancestry or have any signs of sabotage or subversive activities been reported to him by any employees of said corporation or anyone else.

That affiant, because of his many years of residence in the Territory of Hawaii and because of his various positions on this plantation in said Territory has become and has been required to become familiar with the different racial types of inhabitants of said Territory and to know them by name and by racial extraction; and that affiant experiences no difficulty in distinguishing persons of Japanese ancestry from those of other ancestry.

Further deponent sayeth not.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 1st day of April 1942.

HANS L'ORANGE.

[SEAL]

ERLING M. HANSEN,

Notary Public, First Judicial Circuit, Territory of Hawaii.

My commission expires June 30, 1945.

EXHIBIT 67J. PRESENTED BY ROY A. VITOUSEK

AFFIDAVIT OF FREDERIC C. DENISON

TERRITORY OF HAWAII,

City and County of Honolulu, ss:

Frederic C. Denison, being first duly sworn on oath, deposes and says:

That he was born in Honolulu, T. H., on July 26, 1899; that he is a citizen of the United States of America and is of Scotch-English ancestry; that in the year 1925 he entered the employ of Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association, a cooperative organization formed by all of the sugar companies and plantations in the Territory of Hawaii and devoted to coordinating various problems and activities of the sugar companies and also to carrying on various experimental activities, testing new varieties of sugarcane, insect control, etc.; that he is presently the representative of said association of the island of Oahu, said Territory, in charge of the field operations of said association; that said association owns or leases approximately 200 acres of land at various locations on the island of Oahu on which field experiments are conducted; that is to say, the planting, cultivating, harvesting, milling, and testing of new varieties of sugarcane; that each year, during the first week of August, affiant submits to Mr.

Harold L. Lyon (a citizen of English ancestry), director of all experimental work carried on by said association in said Territory, Mr. A. J. Mangelsdorf (a citizen of Holland-Dutch ancestry), geneticist of said association, and Mr. R. J. Borden (a citizen of English ancestry), agriculturalist of said association, a schedule of the work to be performed by affiant during the following 12-month period; that on or about August 1, 1941, affiant submitted such a schedule to Messrs. Lyon, Mangelsdorf, and Borden, for the period from August 1941 to and including July 1942; that said schedule was approved by said three men, a copy of said schedule and the approval thereof being attached hereto as exhibit A and made a part hereof; that among the fields leased by said association for field experimentation is an area of approximately 9.6526 acres in extent and roughly rectangular in shape leased from Ewa Plantation Co., a Hawaiian corporation; that said leased land lies about one-half mile south of the mill of said Ewa Plantation Co. and about 2 miles west of West Loch of Pearl Harbor and about 5 miles northwest from the mouth or entrance of Pearl Harbor; that said leased land is devoted entirely and exclusively to the growing and testing of new varieties of sugarcane and, for convenience in workability, is divided into four fields, all as more fully appears from the map thereof attached hereto as exhibit B; that field No. 4 contains an area of about 2.6715 acres and was intended to be harvested on or about October 15, 1941, and thereafter to be plowed for the planting of seed and that about 70 tons of cane per acre, or 186.9 tons in all, was expected to be produced from said field No. 4; that harvesting operations began, as scheduled, on or about October 15, 1941, and were completed on or about October 31, 1941, and the cane hauled to the mill of Ewa Plantation Co. and milled; that arrangements were made with Mr. J. Douglass Bond (a citizen of Scotch-English ancestry) from the map thereof attached hereto as exhibit B; that field No. 4 prior to the month of January 1942; that because of the outbreak of war said plowing was delayed and was not completed until the end of January and planting operations on said field No. 4 are now taking place.

That prior to the harvesting of said field No. 4, the lands on all sides of said field No. 4 contained a growth of cane varying from 3 to 8 feet in height; that the harvesting of field No. 4 in October 1941 left a bare spot in the midst of many acres of growing cane which bare spot was still apparent (from above the fields) on December 7, 1941; that a few days subsequent to December 7, 1941, officers of the United States Army requested officials of Ewa Plantation Co. to cut a portion of field No. 3 and also a portion of the cane of Ewa Plantation Co. adjoining field No. 4 in order to round the corners which work was promptly done; that the approximate areas of the cane so cut is shown on said exhibit B; that the cutting of this cane was requested because it was felt by said Army officers that the harvesting of field No. 4 in October 1941 had left an area resembling an arrow pointing toward Pearl Harbor; that a line drawn from corner X to corner Z, if extended, would point roughly toward a particular installation in West Loch of Pearl Harbor; that a line drawn from corner Y to corner W, if extended, would point roughly toward the entrance of Pearl Harbor; that affiant does not know which way the Army officials deemed that this arrow pointed; that said field No. 4 is so close to Pearl Harbor (2 miles from West Loch and 5 miles from the entrance to Pearl Harbor) that any airplane over said field No. 4 would automatically be so close to Pearl Harbor that the pilot and crew of such airplane would be able clearly to see their objective without the aid of any arrows or other signs on the ground;

That affiant lives in the district of Waipio, Oahu, aforesaid, which embraces a peninsula extending into Pearl Harbor and bordering West Loch on the west and Middle Loch on the east; that affiant was at Waipio on December 7, 1941; that affiant directs about 40 employees in the field work of said Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association; which includes about 10 employees of Japanese ancestry; that affiant because of his birth and many years of residence in the Territory of Hawaii and because of his position which requires him to know his employees by name and by racial extraction, has become familiar with the various racial types in said Territory and has no difficulty distinguishing persons of Japanese ancestry from those of other ancestry; that affiant in his position finds it necessary to travel from Waipio to the city of Honolulu about three times a week; that his route of travel takes him past Pearl Harbor and Hickam Field; that affiant has observed conditions generally throughout the island of Oahu and particularly between Waipio and Honolulu for many years last past; that affiant at no time up to the date hereof has observed any signs or indications of sabotage or subversive activities on the part of residents of Japanese ancestry, nor have any reports of such activities been submitted to him by any of his employees

under him or by any of his superiors or by anyone else, either before, on, or subsequent to December 7, 1941.

Further deponent sayeth not.

FREDERIC C. DENISON.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 17th day of April 1942.

[SEAL]

ALBERTA VAN BROCKLIN,

Notary Public, First Judicial Circuit, Territory of Hawaii.

My commission expires June 30, 1945.

EXHIBIT A

	TC/A	Area	T. T. cane	Date of harvest	Remarks
Hele. 1.....	60	2.02	121.2	Aug. 25, 1941	Plow.
Ewa 4.....	70	2.67	186.9	Oct. 15, 1941	Do.
P.....	60	4.82	289.2	Oct. 27, 1941	Do.
R.....	60	4.76	285.6	Nov. 3, 1941	Do.
E & F (F. T. 2).....	90	3.37	303.3	Jan. 12, 1942	Ratoon.
27 A and B (pot seedling).....	45	2.39	107.6	Jan. 19, 1942	Plow for pot seedlings.

MOVE TO KAILUA JAN. 21—RETURN TO HELEMANO FEB 5, 1942

Hele. 3.....	80	1.89	151.2	Feb. 9, 1942	Ratoon.
Hele. 4.....	50	2.48	124.0	Feb. 13, 1942	Do.
Hele. 5.....	45	1.66	74.7	Feb. 17, 1942	Plow for pot seedlings.

MOVE TO WAIPIO, FEB. 20, 1942

J.....	60	4.56	273.6	Feb. 23, 1942	Does not include J-6 cc.
T-2.....	50	.74	37.0	Feb. 28, 1942	
S (pots).....	40	3.91	156.4	Mar. 5, 1942	
E (F. T. 1).....	50	1.76	88.0	Mar. 9, 1942	
F (pots).....	50	1.76	88.0	Mar. 11, 1942	
G (F. T. 1).....	50	1.76	88.0	Mar. 13, 1942	

MOVE TO EWA ON MAR. 14, 1942

Ewa 1.....	90	2.34	210.6	Mar. 16, 1942	
Ewa 2 (F. T. 1).....	60	1.47	88.2	Mar. 21, 1942	

MOVE BACK TO WAIPIO, MAR. 23, 1942

K.....	70	4.61	322.7	Mar. 21, 1942	Ratoon.
28.....	70	12.60	882.0	Mar. 23, 1942	Plow.
L.....	100	6.70	670.0	May 1, 1942	
26.....	80	7.06	565.0	May 18, 1942	
19-B.....	70	4.64	324.8	June 1, 1942	
A.....	50	4.78	239.0		To be harvested late in July or August as late as possible.
B.....	55	4.60	253.0		
L-1.....	70	2.45	271.5		Plow this area for 1943 pots. Harvest as late in 1942 as possible.
Hele. 2.....	70				Do.
Ewa 3.....	80				November or December 1942.
C.....	60				Do.
D.....	60				

Above four fields plow for 1943 planting in February. Will be harvested before plantations close down as late as possible.

F. C. DENISON,
Island Representative.

Approved:

HAROLD L. LYON, *Director.*

A. J. MANGELSDORF, *Geneticist.*

R. J. BORDEN, *Agriculturist.*

EXHIBIT 67K. PRESENTED BY ROY A. VITOUSEK

AFFIDAVIT OF J. D. BOND

TERRITORY OF HAWAII,

City and county of Honolulu, ss:

J. D. Bond, being first duly sworn on oath, deposes and says:

That he was born in Kohala, island of Hawaii, T. H., on May 10, 1899; that he is a citizen of the United States of America and is of Scotch-English ancestry; that in the year 1922 he entered the employ of Ewa Plantation Co., a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the Territory of Hawaii and engaged in the business of planting, cultivating, and harvesting sugarcane on the island of Oahu, T. H., and milling and selling the sugar and byproducts therefrom; that from 1922 to 1931 he served successively as night chemist, assistant chemist, assistant agriculturalist, and agriculturalist of said corporation; that in 1931 he became assistant manager of Kohala Sugar Co., a sugar plantation located on the island of Hawaii, said Territory; that in 1935 affiant returned to Ewa Plantation Co. as assistant manager and held that office until October 1937 at which time he was appointed manager of said corporation; that he has served as such manager from October 1937 continuously to the date hereof; that as such manager it is his duty to be, and he has become, thoroughly familiar with all phases of the work of said corporation and of the lands, fields, buildings, and equipment of said corporation;

That said corporation leases approximately 11,500 acres of land, of which approximately 8,600 acres are planted in sugarcane and the remainder is used for roads, ditches, buildings, athletic fields, waste, and pasture lands, etc.; that the lands of said corporation are located approximately 20 miles from the city of Honolulu, said Territory, and approximately 13 miles from Schofield Barracks and border the West Loch of Pearl Harbor, all as can be more fully noted from the map attached hereto and made a part hereof (said plantation lands being colored pink); that said corporation, on December 7, 1941, employed approximately 1,170 employees, of whom approximately 560 were Filipinos, 450 of Japanese ancestry, Caucasian, and 50 miscellaneous.

That prior to the outbreak of hostilities between the United States of America and Japan, affiant was appointed chairman of rural district No. 6 of the Office of Civilian Defense, in charge of the entire area embracing the lands of Ewa Plantation Co. and other lands adjacent thereto; that as such chairman affiant had issued practice emergency calls from time to time to accustom the employees of said corporation to their defense duties;

That at 7:55 o'clock on the morning of December 7, 1941, affiant heard and noticed unusual airplane activity over the vicinity of Pearl Harbor and was first informed at 8:05 o'clock that such activity was hostile and that Japanese planes were bombing Oahu objectives; that he thereupon issued an emergency call and ordered all employees of said corporation to assume their prearranged defense duties, which work was promptly carried out in a most orderly manner with no confusion; that certain defense workers were required to obtain trucks of said corporation and report at certain emergency posts, the trucks to be used for fire fighting, ambulance service, repairs to utility lines, demolition work, etc.; that all trucks or rolling stock of said corporation were accounted for on the morning of December 7, 1941, and no trucks or rolling stock of said corporation were used on that day except in line with civilian emergency defense and a request of the Navy; that various employees of Japanese ancestry were assigned to duty with said trucks and their work was done smoothly and efficiently and in no different fashion as the work performed by employees of other ancestry; that six trucks were dispatched to Pearl Harbor at the request of the Navy but were turned back, the anticipated need for them not materializing.

That during December 7, 1941, personnel of the United States Army moved onto the lands of Ewa Plantation Co.; that in assisting the Army personnel and in overseeing the civilian defense system in that general area, affiant traveled about and observed traffic conditions in that general area (of the corporation's lands and environs); that various persons of Japanese ancestry were driving vehicles on the main highways which bisect said plantation lands; that all of said drivers of Japanese ancestry drove their vehicles in the normal and usual fashion and at the normal and usual rates of speed; that affiant did not see any drivers of Japanese ancestry driving vehicles in any unusual manner or at any unusually

slow or unusually fast rate of speed or in a zigzag fashion or on the wrong side of the road, nor did he see any of such drivers park vehicles across the roads or do any act which might lead to confusion or place others in danger.

That Ewa Plantation Co. subleases approximately 10 acres of land, situated about one-half mile south of its mill, to the Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association, a cooperative organization formed by sugar companies and plantations in the Territory of Hawaii and devoted to coordinating various problems and activities of the sugar companies and also to carrying on various experimental activities, testing new varieties of sugarcane, insect control, etc.; that said 10-acre field above-mentioned is devoted to the growing of new varieties of sugarcane for experimental purposes and is managed by Frederic C. Denison, a citizen of the United States of America, of Scotch-English ancestry; that on or about October 31, 1941, a portion of said 10-acre experimental patch was harvested under order and direction of said Frederic C. Denison; that said harvested portion, surrounded by growing cane, was of a trapezoidal shape such that two corners of it, by a stretch of imagination, could be regarded as pointing toward Pearl Harbor, although any airplane able to look down upon this parcel of cane would also be so close to Pearl Harbor at the time as to be able clearly to see all installations at Pearl Harbor; that on or about December 9, 1941 affiant was requested by authorities of the United States Army to cut the adjacent growing cane both within and without the afore-mentioned 10 acres to round off the edge of the trapezoid and thus obliterate the arrow points.

That at no time was affiant requested to investigate the lands of said corporation for indications that persons, presumably of Japanese ancestry, had burned or cut sugarcane or had otherwise created signs or symbols on or near the plantation lands in the form of arrows to guide Japanese planes toward military objectives; that if any sugarcane on the plantation lands had been burned or cut in the form of arrows or other signs or symbols created upon the lands of the corporation or lands adjacent thereto such would have been immediately noticed by affiant or his subordinates; that affiant has not seen any signs of such activities nor has any such activities been reported to him by his subordinates.

That for several nights subsequent to December 7, 1941, affiant noticed red flares which appeared to be lights discharged by Very signal pistols; that affiant and his subordinates attempted for several nights, as part of the civilian defense program, to investigate these flares but could locate the origin thereof; that similar flares continued to be reported from time to time by the night watch of the civilian defense; that affiant, therefore, presumes that such signals originated from personnel of the United States Army inasmuch as detachments of the Army personnel were at that time and still are exceedingly active throughout the area of Ewa Plantation Co.

That on the morning of December 7, 1941, two cane fires were started by bombs dropped by enemy planes, burning an aggregate of approximately 18 acres before being brought under control; that at about 9 o'clock on the night of December 8, 1941, a cane fire was started by what was reported to be a red flare from a Very pistol, burning a total of approximately 56 acres before being brought under control; that three unplanned cane fires have occurred since that time, none of which, however, can be considered as being due to subversive action; that unplanned cane fires occur from time to time and have occurred from time to time, on all plantations, ever since cane planting was commenced in said Territory many years ago; that all of said fires above-mentioned were extinguished by employees of said corporation, including employees of Japanese ancestry; that all of said employees worked quickly and diligently and without confusion in combatting and extinguishing said fires.

That at no time prior to or subsequent to or on December 7, 1941, has affiant observed any signs of sabotage or subversive activities or signals by blinkers and at no time prior to or subsequent to December 7, 1941, have any signs of sabotage or subversive activities or blinker signals been reported to affiant by any employee of Ewa Plantation Co. or by anyone else.

That affiant, because of his many years of residence in the Territory of Hawaii and because of his various positions on plantations in said Territory has become and has been required to become familiar with the different racial types of inhabitants of said Territory and to know them by name and by racial extraction; and that affiant experiences no difficulty in distinguishing persons of Japanese ancestry from those of other ancestry.

That affiant was recently appointed by the military governor of the Territory of Hawaii to the position of director of labor control of said Territory; that affiant is also continuing his duties as manager of Ewa Plantation Co.

Further deponent saith not.

J. D. BOND.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 10th day of April 1942.

[SEAL]

MILDRED J. AULT,

Notary Public, First Judicial Circuit, Territory of Hawaii.

My commission expires June 30, 1945.

EXHIBIT 67L. PRESENTED BY ROY A. VITOUSEK

AFFIDAVIT OF ROBERT FRICKE

TERRITORY OF HAWAII,

City and county of Honolulu, ss:

Robert Fricke, being first duly sworn on oath, deposes and says:

That he was born in Vienenburg, Germany, on December 25, 1878; that he is a naturalized citizen of the United States of America and is of German ancestry, having lived continuously (except for three short vacation trips) in the Territory of Hawaii since July 30, 1896; that in the year 1897 he entered the employ of Oahu Sugar Co., Ltd.; that from 1897 to 1905 he served as an overseer in said company; that from 1905 to 1908 he served as timekeeper and section overseer with McBryde Sugar Co., Ltd.; that from 1908 to 1913 he served as head overseer with Pacific Sugar Mill Co. (now known as Honokaa Sugar Co.); that from 1913 to 1915 he served as head overseer of Kilauea Sugar Plantation Co.; that from 1915 to 1931 he served as section overseer and head overseer of Oahu Sugar Co., Ltd.; that in April 1931 he was appointed manager of Waianae Co. and has served as manager of Waianae Co. continuously from April 1931, to the date hereof; that all of the foregoing companies are corporations organized and existing under the laws of the Territory of Hawaii and engaged in the business of planting, cultivating and harvesting sugarcane and milling and selling the sugar and byproducts therefrom; that as manager of Waianae Co. it is his duty to be, and he has become, thoroughly familiar with all phases of the work of said corporation and of the lands, fields, buildings, and equipment of said corporation.

That said corporation owns or leases approximately 10,000 acres of land of which approximately 1,239 acres are planted in sugarcane and the remainder is used for roads, ditches, buildings, athletic fields, waste, ranching, and pasture lands, etc.; that the lands of said corporation are located on the island of Oahu, said Territory, approximately 32 miles from the city of Honolulu, approximately 22 miles from Pearl Harbor, approximately 5 miles from Schofield Barracks, and are adjacent to the lands at Lualualei used as a depot by the United States Navy; all as can be more fully noted from the map of Oahu attached hereto and made a part hereof; that said corporation, on December 7, 1941, employed approximately 275 employees, of whom approximately 110 were Filipinos, 120 of Japanese ancestry, 30 Caucasians, and 15 miscellaneous;

That prior to the outbreak of hostilities between Japan and the United States of America, affiant was appointed chairman of rural district No. 5 of the Office of Civilian Defense, in charge of the entire area embracing the lands of Waianae Co. and environs; that as such chairman affiant had issued practice emergency calls from time to time to accustom the employees of said corporation to their defense duties;

That at 7:30 o'clock on the morning of December 7, 1941, affiant went to his office and was at his office at 7:55 o'clock; that he first learned of the bombing of Oahu objectives by Japanese planes at about 9 o'clock on said morning and thereupon went to the Army detachment at Waianae Beach a few hundred feet from said office; that prior to the outbreak of war the United States Army had for several years maintained a small post on Waianae Beach; that affiant was requested by said detachment to keep all employees of said corporation in their homes, except those necessary for emergency guard duty; that all trucks or other equipment of said corporation were accounted for on December 7, 1941, and no trucks or other equipment were taken out; that except for a few employees dispatched by affiant to guard pumps and reservoirs of said corporation, all employees and private residents of the Waianae-Nanakuli district remained in their

homes; that in assisting the Army personnel and in overseeing his employees on guard duty, affiant traveled about and observed traffic conditions generally; that there was no confusion whatsoever; that there was practically no traffic on the roads after 9:15 o'clock in the morning except vehicles owned and operated by the United States Navy and Army; that affiant did not observe any persons of Japanese ancestry driving about in vehicles and did not observe any vehicles whatsoever being driven in an unusual manner or parked across roads or being driven at unusually fast or slow rates of speed;

That at no time was affiant requested by anyone to inspect the cane fields and other lands of Waianae Co. for indications that patches of cane may have been cut or burned in the shape of arrows pointing toward military objectives or for other signs of subversive activities; that subsequent to December 7, 1941, ordinary work of the corporation has been carried out, including irrigation, cultivation, and harvesting, etc., of the sugarcane and the care of animals on the ranch and pasture lands of said corporation; that had any cane been cut or burned in the form of arrows or any other subversive activity been performed, such would have been noticed by affiant and his subordinates; that up to the date hereof affiant has not observed any signs of any sabotage or subversive activity whatsoever and no signs of sabotage or subversive activity have been reported to affiant by any of his employees or anyone else.

That 2 or 3 nights after December 7, 1941, at the request of officers of the United States Army, affiant joined a group of Army personnel in a search for signal flares throughout Lualualei Valley; that affiant remained with said group until 11 o'clock at night and that no member of said group noticed any flares of any sort; that affiant to the date hereof has not seen any signal flares or "blinkers" and no person has reported the existence of any such to him; that on this same night Filipino and Japanese employees of a lime quarry about a half-mile distant from affiant's office ignited a brush fire in order to clear land intended to be quarried, but shortly after said fire was set, personnel of the United States Army requested that said fire be extinguished and said employees promptly complied with said request.

That affiant, because of his many years of residence in the Territory of Hawaii and because of his various positions on plantations in said Territory has become and has been required to become familiar with the different racial types of inhabitants of said Territory and to know them by name and by racial extraction; and that affiant experiences no difficulty in distinguishing persons of Japanese ancestry from those of other ancestry.

Further deponent sayeth not.

ROBERT FRICKE.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 30th day of March 1942.

[SEAL]

ALBERTA VAN BROCKLIN,

Notary Public, First Judicial Circuit, Territory of Hawaii.

My commission expires June 30, 1945.

EXHIBIT 67M. PRESENTED BY ROY A. VITOUSEK

AFFIDAVIT OF JOHN H. MIDKIFF

TERRITORY OF HAWAII,

City and County of Honolulu, ss:

John H. Midkiff, being first duly sworn on oath, deposes and says:

That he was born in Stonington, Ill., on January 16, 1893; that he is a citizen of the United States of America and is of Scotch-Irish ancestry; that in the year 1924 he entered the employ of Waialua Agricultural Co., Ltd., a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the Territory of Hawaii and engaged in the business of planting, cultivating, and harvesting sugarcane on the island of Oahu, said Territory, and milling and selling the sugar and byproducts therefrom; that from 1924 to 1926 he served as general overseer of said corporation; that in 1926 he was appointed head overseer of said corporation and served in that capacity until 1930; that in 1930 he was appointed assistant manager of said corporation and held that office until August 1932 at which time he was appointed manager of said corporation; that he has served as manager of said corporation from August 1932 continuously to the date hereof; that as such manager it is his duty to be, and he has become, thoroughly familiar with all

phases of the work of said corporation and of the lands, fields, buildings, and equipment of said corporation.

That said corporation owns or leases approximately 47,000 acres of land of which approximately 10,000 acres are planted in sugarcane and the remainder is used for roads, ditches, buildings, athletic fields, waste and pasture lands, etc., or leased to Hawaiian Pineapple Co., Ltd., and California Packing Corp., for the planting of pineapples; that the lands of said corporation are located approximately 30 miles from the city of Honolulu, Oahu, T. H., and approximately 20 miles from Pearl Harbor, and border, on the southern side, the lands of Schofield Barracks, all as can be more fully noted from the map attached hereto and made a part hereof, the corporation's lands used for the growing of sugarcane being colored pink and the corporation's lands leased for pineapple growing being colored green; that said corporation, on December 7, 1941, employed approximately 1,220 employees, of whom approximately 500 were Filipinos, 500 of Japanese ancestry, 170 Caucasian, and 50 miscellaneous.

That prior to the outbreak of hostilities between the United States of America and Japan, affiant was appointed chairman of rural district No. 3 of the Office of the Civilian Defense, in charge of the entire area embracing the lands of Waialua Agricultural Co., Ltd., and other lands adjacent thereto; that as such chairman affiant had issued practice emergency calls from time to time to accustom the employees of said corporation to their defense duties.

That shortly after 7:55 o'clock on the morning of December 7, 1941, affiant heard machine-gun fire and great airplane activity and was first informed at approximately 8:30 o'clock that such activity was hostile and that Japanese planes were bombing Oahu objectives; that he thereupon issued an emergency call and ordered all employees of said corporation to assume their prearranged defense duties, which work was promptly carried out in a most orderly manner with no confusion; that certain defense workers are required to obtain trucks of said corporation and report at certain emergency posts, the trucks to be used for fire fighting, ambulance service, repairs to utility lines, demolition work, etc., that all trucks or rolling stock of said corporation were accounted for on the morning of December 7, 1941, and no trucks or rolling stock were used on that day except in line with civilian emergency defense; that various employees of Japanese ancestry were assigned to duty with said trucks and their work was done smoothly and efficiently and in no different fashion as the work performed by employees of other ancestry; that said trucks proceeded to their appointed posts and remained there throughout the day and night of December 7, 1941, being manned by employee defense crews at all times.

That during December 7, 1941, personnel of the United States Army moved onto the lands of said corporation, pitching tents and taking over various buildings; that in assisting the Army personnel and in overseeing the civilian defense system in that general area, affiant traveled about and observed traffic conditions in that general area (of the corporation's lands—sugar and pineapple—and environs); that various persons of Japanese ancestry were driving vehicles on the main highways which bisect said plantation lands; that all of said drivers of Japanese ancestry drove their vehicles in the normal and usual fashion and at the normal and usual rates of speed; that affiant did not see any drivers of Japanese ancestry driving vehicles in any unusual manner or at any unusually slow or unusually fast rate of speed or in a zigzag fashion or on the wrong side of the road, nor did he see any of such drivers park vehicles across the roads or do any act which might lead to confusion or place others in danger.

That at about 1 o'clock on the afternoon of December 8, 1941, affiant was informed by Maj. Gen. (Retired) B. H. Wells, secretary of the Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association, of rumors to the effect that persons, presumably of Japanese ancestry, had burned or cut sugarcane or had otherwise created signs or symbols on or near the plantation lands in the form of arrows to guide Japanese planes toward military objectives and was asked to check these rumors; that affiant immediately ordered J. M. Morrison (a citizen of English ancestry), civil engineer of said corporation, to thoroughly investigate all plantation lands and lands adjacent thereto for signs of such activity; that affiant also thereupon personally joined in such investigation; that neither affiant nor Mr. Morrison observed any signs of any such activity and that said investigation proved that said rumors, insofar as Waialua Agricultural Co., Ltd., lands (sugar and pineapple) and lands adjacent thereto were concerned, to be entirely groundless; that subsequent to December 8, 1941, further checks of plantation lands were made, being either intentional investigations for that purpose or being investi-

gations incidental to normal plantation field activities; that all of the plantation lands and lands adjacent thereto have been thoroughly inspected and that no signs of the remotest character of such activities by any person or persons, of Japanese ancestry or otherwise, have been observed by affiant or reported to him by any of the employees of said corporation or by anyone else.

That at no time prior to, subsequent to, or on December 7, 1941, has affiant observed any signs of sabotage or subversive activities by persons of Japanese ancestry or any searchlights, signals, flares, lights, or blinkers (except those controlled by the United States Army) or have any signs of sabotage or subversive activities or searchlights, signals, flares, lights, or blinkers been reported to him by any employees of said corporation or anyone else; that the office of rural civilian defense district No. 3 has remained open 24 hours a day from December 7, 1941, to date with watchers on duty at all times.

That affiant, because of his many years of residence in the Territory of Hawaii and because of his various positions on plantations in said Territory has become and has been required to become familiar with the different racial types of inhabitants of said Territory and to know them by name and by racial extraction; and that affiant experiences no difficulty in distinguishing persons of Japanese ancestry from those of other ancestry.

Further deponent sayeth not.

JOHN H. MIDKIFF.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 4th day of April 1942.

[SEAL]

A. ANDERSEN,

Notary Public, First Judicial Circuit, Territory of Hawaii.

My Commission expires June 30, 1945.

EXHIBIT 67N. PRESEKTED BY ROY A. VITOUSEK

AFFIDAVIT OF JAMES N. ORRICK

TERRITORY OF HAWAII,

City and county of Honolulu, ss:

James N. Orrick, being first duly sworn on oath, deposes and says:

That he was born in Fort Worth, Tex., on September 8, 1904; that he is a citizen of the United States of America and is of Scotch-English ancestry; that in the year 1923 he entered the employ of Kahuku Plantation Co., a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the Territory of Hawaii and engaged in the business of planting, cultivating, and harvesting sugarcane on the island of Oahu, said Territory, and milling and selling the sugar and byproducts therefrom; that from 1923 to 1925 he served as electrician of said corporation; that in 1925 he was appointed electrical and pump superintendent of said corporation and served in that capacity until 1935; that in 1935 he became factory superintendent of Waiialua Agricultural Co., Ltd., a sugar plantation located a few miles from the lands of Kahuku Plantation Co.; that in 1937 affiant returned to Kahuku Plantation Co. as assistant manager and held that office until May 1940 at which time he was appointed manager of said corporation; that he has served as manager of said corporation from May 1940 continuously to the date hereof; that as such manager it is his duty to be, and he has become, thoroughly familiar with all phases of the work of said corporation and of the lands, fields, buildings, and equipment of said corporation;

That said corporation owns or leases approximately 10,000 acres of land of which approximately 4,300 acres are planted in sugarcane and the remainder is used for roads, ditches, buildings, athletic fields, waste and pasture lands, etc.; that the lands of said corporation are located approximately 30 miles from the city of Honolulu, Oahu, T. H., and approximately 30 miles from Pearl Harbor, and approximately 20 miles from Schofield Barracks, all as can be more fully noted from the map attached hereto and made a part hereof (said plantation lands being colored pink); that said corporation, on December 7, 1941, employed approximately 675 employees, of whom approximately 375 were Filipinos, 175 of Japanese ancestry, 55 Caucasian, and 70 miscellaneous;

That prior to the outbreak of hostilities between the United States of America and Japan, affiant was appointed Chairman of Rural District No. 2 of the Office of Civilian Defense, in charge of the entire area embracing the lands of Kahuku Plantation Co. and other lands adjacent thereto; that as such chairman affiant

had issued practice emergency calls from time to time to accustom the employees of said corporation to their defense duties;

That at 7:55 o'clock on the morning of December 7, 1941, affiant was eating breakfast; that he first learned of the commencement of the bombing of Oahu objectives by the Japanese war planes at 8:10 o'clock on said morning and thereafter issued an emergency call and ordered all employees of said corporation to assume their prearranged defense duties, which work was promptly carried out in a most orderly manner with no confusion; that certain defense workers were required to obtain trucks of said corporation and report at certain emergency posts, the trucks to be used for fire fighting, ambulance service, repairs to utility lines, demolition work, etc.; that all trucks or rolling stock of said corporation were accounted for on the morning of December 7, 1941, and no trucks or rolling stock of said corporation were used on that day except in line with civilian emergency defense; that various employees of Japanese ancestry were assigned to duty with said trucks and their work was done smoothly and efficiently and in no different fashion as the work performed by employees of other ancestry; that although all of such trucks proceeded to their appointed posts, no use thereof became necessary throughout the day and the trucks remained at their posts, off the roads, throughout the day and night of December 7, 1941, being manned by employee defense crews at all times;

That during December 7, 1941, personnel of the United States Army moved onto the lands of Kahuku Plantation Co., pitching tents and taking over various buildings; that in assisting the Army personnel and in overseeing the civilian defense system in that general area, affiant traveled about and observed traffic conditions in that general area (of the corporation's lands and environs); that various persons of Japanese ancestry were driving vehicles on the main belt-road highway which bisects and borders said plantation lands; that all of said drivers of Japanese ancestry drove their vehicles in the normal and usual fashion and at the normal and usual rates of speed; that affiant did not see any drivers of Japanese ancestry driving vehicles in any unusual manner or at any unusually slow or unusually fast rate of speed or in a zigzag fashion or on the wrong side of the road, nor did he see any of such drivers park vehicles across the roads or do any act which might lead to confusion or place others in danger;

That at about 1 o'clock on the afternoon of December 8, 1941, affiant was informed by Maj. Gen. B. H. Wells (retired), secretary of the Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association, of rumors to the effect that persons, presumably of Japanese ancestry, had burned or cut sugarcane or had otherwise created signs or symbols on or near the plantation lands in the form of arrows to guide Japanese planes toward military objectives and was asked to check these rumors; that affiant immediately ordered Kenneth C. Ross (a citizen of English-Hawaiian ancestry), cultivation overseer of said corporation, to thoroughly investigate all plantation lands and lands adjacent thereto for signs of such activity; that affiant also thereupon personally joined in such investigation; that neither affiant nor Mr. Ross observed any signs of any such activity and that said investigation proved that said rumors, insofar as Kahuku Plantation Co. lands and lands adjacent thereto were concerned, to be entirely groundless; that subsequent to December 8, 1941, further checks of plantation lands were made, being either intentional investigations for that purpose or being investigations incidental to normal plantation field activities; that all of the plantation lands and lands adjacent thereto have been thoroughly inspected and that no signs of the remotest character of such activities or any sabotage whatsoever or any activities tending to lead to public confusion, or upsetting of normal, routine life, by any person or persons, of Japanese ancestry or otherwise have been observed by affiant or reported to him by any of the employees of said corporation or by anyone else;

That affiant, at the request of Army authorities, sent, during the months of December 1941 and January and February 1942, employees of said corporation, totaling 21,000 man-days of labor, as well as considerable equipment of said corporation, to various Army posts to do such work as digging gun emplacements, building airfields, cutting brush, etc., that among said men so sent were men of Japanese ancestry (citizens and aliens); that all of said men have been accepted by the Army authorities; that affiant has been personally told by the ranking Army officers in charge of this work that the work of said men and equipment has been of great assistance and that said men have been found to be loyal and efficient; that since February 1942 to date affiant has continued to send men of said corporation to said Army posts to do said work;

That all residents of Rural Defense Area No. 2, regardless of their ancestry, have been cooperative and have filled their positions to affiant's satisfaction; that throughout the present emergency the Japanese community in said area has been active in Red Cross work and generous in donations of time and money;

That affiant, because of his many years of residence in the Territory of Hawaii and because of his various positions on plantations in said Territory has become and has been required to become familiar with the different racial types of inhabitants of said Territory and to know them by name and by racial extraction; and that affiant experiences no difficulty in distinguishing persons of Japanese ancestry from those of other ancestry.

Further deponent sayeth not.

JAMES N. ORRICK,

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 6th day of April 1942.

[SEAL]

ARTHUR J. WRISTON,

Notary Public, First Judicial Circuit, Territory of Hawaii.

My commission expires June 30, 1945.

EXHIBIT 68. PRESENTED BY HAWAIIAN EQUAL RIGHTS COMMISSION

FACTS CONCERNING THE B. P. BISHOP ESTATE, THE FOUNDATION OF THE KAMEHAMEHA SCHOOLS IN HAWAII

Mrs. Bishop's estate, the endowment of the Kamehameha Schools, was valued at about \$300,000 at the time of her death in 1884. She had just inherited the bulk of it a year before she died, through the death of her cousin Princess Ruth Keelikolani. It consisted chiefly of lands on the five principal islands of the Territory—the larger part of the private lands of the Kamehameha family. The Kamehameha dynasty came to an end with Mrs. Bishop but it nevertheless continues to live in the Kamehameha Schools in the form of a perpetual trust to the honor of the Kamehamehas and for the benefit of Hawaiian boys and girls.

The net worth of the endowment as of June 30, 1945, is \$15,000,000 in round figures:

Income property (lands and buildings)-----	\$10,000,000
Kamehameha Schools properties-----	2,000,000
Stocks, bonds, notes, etc-----	3,000,000
Total-----	15,000,000

The total area of land owned by the endowment is 374,000 acres. This represents approximately 9 percent of the total area of the eight principal islands in this group. It is less than 25 percent of the land owned by the Territory of Hawaii. The lands are classified as:

Class	Area	Percent of total
	<i>Acres</i>	
Waste land-----	117,000	31.3
Forest and timberland-----	80,000	21.4
Grazing, pasture, and dairy-----	125,600	33.5
Agricultural lands-----	47,500	12.7
Sugar-----	18,300	
Pineapple-----	2,600	
Other-----	7,900	
Marginal-----	9,000	
Small farms-----	9,600	
Wet agricultural-----	100	
Home sites and potential home sites-----	2,150	
Business and industrial-----	250	1.1
Miscellaneous lands-----	1,500	
Kamehameha Schools campus-----	470	
Golf courses-----	350	
Fish ponds-----	680	
Total-----	374,000	100.0

Eighty-six percent of the entire Bishop estate holdings are of relatively little value. The waste lands on the lava-covered slopes of West Hawaii produce no income. Forest reserves, set apart to safeguard the water supply on the several islands, yield approximately \$30,000 annually in revenues from leases of water rights. The grazing lands yield approximately \$18,000 in rents each year. Altogether 86 percent of the entire land area of the estate (322,600 acres) produces an income of less than \$50,000 per year, or less than 2 percent of the annual net income of the trust.

The revenues on which the schools draw for their operating needs come chiefly from an area of approximately 50,000 acres or 14 percent of the total area of estate lands. Last year (ended June 30, 1945) the net income from this source after paying property taxes amounted to more than \$1,000,000.

Many people are under the impression that the Bishop estate pays no taxes. This is true so far as Federal and Territorial income taxes are concerned by reason of the fact that this is an eleemosynary or charitable trust. We pay all of the other taxes, however. Last year our tax bill was approximately \$500,000.

Mrs. Bishop's will directs the trustees to hold and manage the lands of the estate, although it permits them to sell land to provide funds for the erection of school buildings or to sell when it may be in the best interests of the estate to do so. Because of their long-established policy pursuant to the will to lease for a term of years rather than to sell the land outright, many people have the impression that the trustees do not sell land at all. A look at the record, however, will show that substantial sales have been made.

(1) Residence subdivisions:

	Area in acres
Beach Walk tract, Waikiki-----	10
McInerney tract, Kapalama-----	152
Bingham Park tract, Kapaaakea-----	28
Nioloa and Kawananakoa, Nuuanu Avenue-----	20
Manoa Uplands, Manoa Valley-----	17
St. Louis Heights, Kaimuki district-----	68
Others (Kamehameha Park tract, Dole Street)-----	8
Total area-----	303

The total sales price for these tracts including the cost of development was in excess of \$1,000,000. A total of 1,650 residential lots were thereby added to the city of Honolulu.

(2) Condemned areas: During the past 10 years the Government of the United States, the Territory of Hawaii and the city and county of Honolulu have taken Bishop estate land for public use either by court proceedings in eminent domain or by negotiation. In the 10-year period from 1935 to 1944 inclusive, this taking has involved 1,225 acres and the prices paid have amounted to a total of approximately \$1,100,000.

(3) Other lands sold: During the past 10 years from 1935 to 1944 inclusive, the trustees have sold land to individuals and corporations as a result of private negotiations to the extent of 8,600 acres with the total of all considerations paid in excess of \$600,000.

The total proceeds of the sale of the trust as herein described was \$2,700,000. A total area of 10,128 acres was involved. It is not by any means a complete statement of the outright sales of Bishop estate land since the inception of the trust.

Purpose of the Kamehameha Schools: It was Mrs. Bishop's desire that her trustees provide a good education for Hawaiian boys and girls "in the common English branches, and also instruction in morals and in such useful knowledge as may tend to make good and industrious men and women * * *."

Hawaiians, like all other races in Hawaii, seek the life in towns and cities. This being the case, it is better to train our Hawaiian boys and girls in those fields of useful knowledge that will enable them successfully to compete with the children of other races for survival in an urban environment. The professions, business, skilled trades, and many useful and highly gainful occupations should include Hawaiians in proper proportion to their representation in the total population. The Kamehameha Schools aim to train Hawaiian boys and girls to fill these responsible positions in the community. The enrollment has increased substantially in recent years and will continue to increase so long as the Bishop estate, the foundation of the schools, rests secure.

Copies of the Educational Policy of the Kamehameha Schools are submitted herewith.

Respectfully submitted.

BOARD OF TRUSTEES, B. P. BISHOP ESTATE,
By GEORGE M. COLLINS, *President*.

EXHIBIT 71. PRESENTED BY ROY C. KESNER

STATISTICS RELATING TO BUSINESS OPPORTUNITIES IN HAWAII
CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF HONOLULU,
Honolulu 16, T. H., January 15, 1946.

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.,

Chairman, and Members of the 1946 Congressional Committee on Statehood.

GENTLEMEN: The following tables and comment are submitted as part of my statement concerning retailers and small businesses in Hawaii: (see p. 419):

I. FIELDS IN WHICH OPPORTUNITIES FOR NEW BUSINESSES MAY EXIST IN THE FUTURE

Recently an inquiry was received from the Department of Commerce concerning opportunities for establishing new businesses in Hawaii. Consideration led to a reply along the following lines:

"Whereas it is difficult to state in what lines the most promising opportunities for establishing new business will occur, it is felt that there will be large numbers of the service and amusement type of business such as have been set up during wartime that will continue after the war, many of them becoming more and more substantial. It is hoped that certain manufacturing businesses that have been emerging during the past few years will retain their strength and grow steadily. These may include the processing of taro and other tropical foods, vegetables, and fruits. It would seem practicable to combine the fats from large quantities of swill available here and from copra which can be brought in from the Pacific Islands, with imported alkalis to manufacture soap. Many farmers have gained experience in producing truck crops during the war and it is possible that such production will continue and even expand later. Possibly the processing of papaias and avocados, litchis, and especially the culture and air shipment of orchids, may become substantial enterprises. Hawaii will be a fine location for producing silk if the machinery for unwinding cocoons and winding the yarn become perfected. Certainly the field for air conditioning and refrigeration will be very large and there will be many new firms to carry on this work. The same is expected in the field of plastics fabrication and the use of other new construction materials. Pulverized lava may be found useful when mixed with cement to form 'Haydite.' An interest in Hawaiian and Polynesian arts and crafts has developed employing fibers such as lauhala, olona, etc. and articles of fine Hawaiian wood. The lauhala and local fibers make good mats, coasters, hats, etc. It is possible that a new broadcasting station will prosper. Candy manufacturing has taken a new start during the war and it should continue successfully. There is room for a number of first-class restaurants, tea rooms, etc., notwithstanding the fact that we have large numbers of restaurants of varying quality at the present time. The development of the fishing industry—catching and processing fish—is to be promoted. The freezing of many of our tropical foods and items for shipment to the mainland is a practicable possibility, it is believed.

"Hawaii does expect a very large tourist trade following the war. There will be need for additional hotels, particularly for hotels near the beaches and near recreational areas. It is not believed that tourist camps of the mainland type for long-range touring motorists will have much chance for success here. The oil companies have fairly well occupied most of the available and strategic locations with service stations, but a few more doubtless will be set up here and there as the highway system is expanded. At the present time, we seem to have a plethora of liquor stores and small drug stores. There is always a chance for high-quality stores, barber shops, beauty shops, etc., in competition with existing establishments. The one-stop market and service area is being looked upon with favor for Honolulu postwar."

II. SMALL BUSINESS VERSUS LARGE CORPORATIONS IN HAWAII

The Chamber of Commerce of Honolulu is supposed to represent the various business firms and interests of Honolulu. It is safe to say that four out of five of its member firms would be classed as small businesses, even by Hawaiian standards.

Hawaii does not have any big business in the sense of the term as used in Washington. We have nothing like the mainland's large steel corporations, the automotive industries, the electric manufacturing firms, etc. However, we do have several local as well as mainland substantial corporations, and very recently the Department of Commerce specifically asked if the economy of Hawaii is "dominated by large corporations to such an extent as to lessen the chances of small businesses."

There is keen and open competition here. It is in general fair competition among good businessmen and not much of the fly-by-night variety. Competition alone lessens the chances for survival of many new businesses. However, though competition weeds out the weak, it also is recognized as "the life of trade." Large firms compete among themselves as well as against new and smaller firms.

We have not alone the five "agency" corporations in Hawaii, whose function chiefly is to serve the sugar and pineapple plantations, ranches, etc. In addition to these and competing with these, we have well over 36,000 business establishments that independently make gross income returns and purchase licenses. It would be my opinion that only a small fraction of 1 percent of these are dominated by Hawaii's large local corporations. Each business is free to buy and sell. It is sought out by all local banks and money lenders if its enterprise looks safe; it can borrow money to set up new enterprises or expand old ones.

All one needs to do is to turn through the pages of the classified business directory to see the wide range of persons and corporations engaged in business here. These businesses are owned and operated by thousands of people of every race.

A specific case history of the growth of small businesses in a community will illustrate how these new enterprises typically got their start and gained strength. A large sugar plantation, controlled by one of the Big Five agencies, now has within the community which grew up around its mill a large number of retail establishments and shops. These establishments render all kinds of services and they are in direct competition with the large plantation general store and shops. Most of them are owned and operated by former plantation workers. At first, there were only the plantation store and shops and at that time practically all residents in the community were employees of the plantation. Now the plantation needed the employees and was forced annually to bring in from abroad at great expense many new employees as the plantation grew. Also, the plantation-owned and operated general store wished the local business. But the plantation elected the sublease or sell areas to its former employees when the latter decided they wanted to go into business for themselves. Nor did the large plantation store seek by ruinous competition to crowd out the new competing enterprises. The long-term policy prevailed of encouraging the growth of a good American community, with free enterprise, free education, and adequate community activities of all sorts.

The reply made to the question posed by the Department of Commerce as to whether the large corporations here lessen the chances of success of small businesses is herewith entered into the record for your consideration:

"It is believed that the economy of Hawaii heretofore largely has been dependent upon three factors: (1) Sugar and pineapple; (2) the armed forces; and (3) tourists. It is hoped that a greatly expanded fishing industry will give us a fourth leg to stand on. For many years, up until the reciprocity treaty in 1876, the sugar industry struggled on, hardly getting back a new dollar for an old one. Since reciprocity, sugar has been profitable and is one of our large exports. Recently pineapples have come in and have challenged sugar. Certainly these two great industries compete keenly for labor. The exports of raw sugar run around \$65,000,000 and of pineapples (chiefly canned products) \$55,000,000, this latter value including the cost of cans. In addition to these two great crops, there are other agricultural exports such as hides, papayas, bananas, nuts, and a few other items.

"The arable land of the Territory is very limited. It is less than that of one typical mainland county, 23 miles square. On this area, broken up oftentimes into small parts by streams, gulches, and bays, is produced around \$150,000,000 worth of agricultural products annually. This means most intensive and indus-

trialized use of the arable land and of water. Hawaii has, therefore, developed highly industrialized agriculture. Agriculture in Hawaii, to be successful, has followed the pattern of industry on the mainland. Most mainlanders are surprised at this—think it very strange because it is so different from typical small farming in America, and do not understand it at first. Also, this makes the small amount of arable land having adequate rainfall or access to irrigation water, very expensive and subject to high competitive bids.

"For a long time the money made by shipping sugar and pineapples from the Territory was relied upon almost exclusively as exchange for other commodities not available here but purchased abroad. Under those conditions, it is natural that the industrialized agricultural industries should exert a very great influence on the economy, as well as the social life of Hawaii. Leaders in local industry and agriculture all have lived right here in Hawaii, have lived among its peoples and its problems, and have invested the profits and earning of the local corporations right here in Hawaiian improvements. The welfare of their own families has been bound up with the welfare of all the people of Hawaii because all are close neighbors and all in the same boat out here in the middle of the ocean.

"The Hawaiian population that had dwindled seriously up to 1876 was restored by the Hawaiian Sugar Planters Association's importing laborers to grow sugar, and the population has been increased very largely due to this unusual economic set-up until recent years. It corresponds to the increases in population in mainland America by waves of immigrants from Europe.

"In the year 1876 referred to, there was established a new and life-giving relationship between the Kingdom of Hawaii and the United States of America. This was the Reciprocity Treaty. As a result of this new and closer tie with America, Hawaii was enabled to supply agricultural products that America needed and to purchase from America large volumes of products for sale by American factories.

"This close tie with America has proved highly beneficial to both America and Hawaii in every way, ever since its inception in 1876. Hawaii has been one of America's leading customers as compared with all other trade openings outside of the mainland United States. The United States has bought Hawaii's products and enabled the people of these islands to purchase and enjoy American tools, household equipment, clothing, food, magazines, and books. Many new enterprises exist by the turn-over of the primary money dug out of Hawaii's soil by the basic agricultural crops of sugar and pineapples.

"A few years ago, the tourist industry began to exert a noticeable influence in Hawaii's economy and activities and social life. This trade averaged about \$10,000,000 new money each year prior to the war. There is reason to believe that there will be a greater income to the Territory from this source after the war and many new enterprises supported thereby. Hawaii's climate and natural beauty are great attractions and new and improved transportation facilities will make travel much more convenient after the war. This is further new money that turns over three or four times each year and results in new businesses.

"Along about 1938 or 1939, defense work began to be a substantial factor in Hawaii. The armed forces were increased and civilian employees of the Army and Navy greatly increased in number. After the Pearl Harbor attack, the numbers of armed forces and civilian employees of the Army and Navy shot up tremendously and now for the first time in the history of the Territory the Caucasian population, not including the armed forces, has exceeded any other element of the population. All this resulted in many new businesses.

"Many new firms from the mainland are represented in Hawaii and they go about their business exactly as they would if they were on the mainland. For example, a mainland firm like Sears, Roebuck & Co., which is very substantial here doubtless would state that the fact that there are sugar and pineapple industries here and great corporations, has no adverse effect whatever on their business so that they proceed just exactly as if there were no sugar or pineapple corporations. Following is a list of several other mainland firms that have branches here and that compete with local corporations:

PARTIAL LIST OF MAINLAND CORPORATIONS REGISTERED WITH THE TERRITORIAL
TREASURER TO DO BUSINESS IN HAWAII

(Over 70 listed here)

Air Cargo Inc., Washington, D. C.
American Can Co., New York, N. Y.

American Savings and Loan Association, Salt Lake City, Utah.
 Associated Oil Co., 76 Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.
 Armour & Co. of Delaware, Chicago, Ill.
 Bata Shoe Co., Inc., New York, N. Y.
 Boston Safe Deposit & Trust Co., 100 Franklin Street, Boston, Mass.
 Butler Bros., 426 West Randolph Street, Chicago, Ill.
 Burroughs Adding Machine Co., Detroit, Mich.
 Braun-Knecht-Heimann Co., 1400 Sixteenth Street, San Francisco, Calif.
 California Packing Corp., New York, N. Y.
 Commercial Pacific Cable Co., New York, N. Y.
 Coca-Cola Export Corp., Wilmington, Del.
 Creameries of America Inc., Los Angeles, Calif.
 Dearborn Chemical Co., Chicago, Ill.
 Dohrmann Hotel Supply Co., Reno, Nev.
 Elizabeth Arden Sales Corp., 681 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
 Electric Steel Foundry, 2458 Northwest York Street, Portland, Oreg.
 Federal Services Finance Corp., Washington, D. C.
 Fibreboard Products Inc., 710 Russ Building, San Francisco, Calif.
 Glidden Co., Cleveland, Ohio.
 General Paint Corp., 2627 Arming Street, San Francisco, Calif.
 General Motors Acceptance Corp., New York, N. Y.
 General Mills, Inc., Minneapolis, Minn.
 General Cigar Co., 119 West Fortieth Street, New York, N. Y.
 Globe Wireless, Ltd., Reno, Nev.
 S. Gumpert Co., Inc., 94-02 One Hundred and Fourth Street, Ozone Park, N. Y.
 Grinnell Co. of the Pacific, Providence, R. I.
 Graybar Electric Co., Inc., Forty-third and Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
 The Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., Inc., 100 West Tenth Street, Wilmington, Del.
 S. & Gump Co., Post Street, San Francisco, Calif.
 Charles R. Hadley Co., Los Angeles, Calif.
 Henry Rose Stores, Inc., 360 West Thirty-first Street, New York, N. Y.
 Julius Rothschild & Co., 52 Main Street, San Francisco, Calif.
 S. H. Kress & Co., 114 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
 Kodak Hawaii, Ltd., Rochester, N. Y.
 Libby, McNeill & Libby, Chicago, Ill.
 Mackay Radio and Telegraph Co., San Francisco, Calif.
 McKesson & Robbins, Inc., 10 Light Street, Baltimore, Md.
 Morgan & Allen Co., Post Street, San Francisco, Calif.
 Nestle's Milk Products, Inc., New York, N. Y.
 National Cash Register Co., Dayton, Ohio.
 National Dollar Stores, Ltd., San Francisco, Calif.
 National Biscuit Co., 15 Exchange Place, Jersey City, N. J.
 The Permanente Corp., 1522 Latham Square Building, Oakland, Calif.
 Perfection Stove Co., Cleveland, Ohio.
 Patek & Co., Los Angeles, Calif.
 Pressed Steel Car Co., Inc., Brant Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
 R. L. Polk, Detroit, Mich.
 Rainier Brewing Co., 1550 Bryant Street, San Francisco, Calif.
 RCA Communications, 233 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
 Remington Rand, Inc., Buffalo, N. Y.
 Railway Express Agency, Inc., Wilmington, Del.
 Sears, Roebuck & Co., Chicago, Ill.
 Schenley International Corp., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
 Singer Sewing Machine, Elizabeth, N. J.
 Shell Oil Co., Inc., Richmond, Va.
 State Savings and Loan Association, Salt Lake City, Utah.
 Standard Oil Co. of California, 7 West Tenth Street, Wilmington, Del.
 Standard Brands, Inc., Wilmington, Del.
 Sterling Drug, Inc., 170 Varick Street, New York, N. Y.
 Swift & Co., 4115 Packers Avenue, Chicago Ill.
 Tide Water Associated Oil, Wilmington, Del.
 The Upjohn Co., Kalamazoo, Mich.
 Union Oil Co. of California, Los Angeles, Calif.
 Western Electric Co., Inc. 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
 Western Auto Supply Co., Los Angeles, Calif.
 Weekly Publications, Inc., New York, N. Y.

Winthrop Chemical Co., Inc., 170 Varick Street, New York, N. Y.
 Zion's Securities Corp., 13 West South Temple Street, Salt Lake City, Utah.
 Chemical Co., Inc., New York, N. Y.

"Doubtless the relative importance of industrialized agriculture in the Territory, in comparison with income from military establishments and tourists, will decrease from now on and many new enterprises will exert their influence. All people in Hawaii, as a general rule, look upon this as beneficial, and this view is shared by leaders in the sugar and pineapple industries.

"A concluding summary of this above statement regarding new and small business ventures in Hawaii would be that if a new firm wishes to come in and will render suitable and acceptable service, the people will patronize it and those who patronize it are just as likely to be the officials of the sugar and pineapple industries and their wives, as any other class of people."

III. EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY IN HAWAII

A highly distinctive characteristic of the American way of life is equality of opportunity for all. The best proof of equality of opportunity in a community is the actual and steady advancement of immigrant groups coming into that community, in wealth and in preferred positions. All groups have "gotten ahead" in these matters just as they have done well in small businesses.

How does Hawaii measure up in respect to equality of opportunity for all?

There is a very clear correlation between the length of time elapsed since the various immigrant groups arrived in Hawaii and the property and preferred positions the individuals and families of these various groups now possess. Evidence is presented herewith to show that Hawaii has this basic and distinctive characteristic of an American community.

Probably most mainlanders who are strangers to Hawaii think of the Territory as a group of South Sea islands, with coconut trees, white sand beaches, blue lagoons, and hula maidens. Newcomers too often look upon the color of the skin and hear the pidgin English or the unusual tongues, and think Hawaii is characteristically oriental. But these appearances are deceiving. A few facts and a small number of bottom figures—all of which are substantiated in official records—will demonstrate that Hawaii qualifies as an American community because the people here have the opportunity to progress in American ways of life and they do so progress.

The attached table has the most recent figures of the sort we could find. If 1940 figures were at hand, the evidence would be even far more striking.

TABLE XXXV.—"Preferred" positions and length of residence (adult males) in Hawaii as of 1930

Group	Average length of time in Hawaii as of 1930	Percent in preferred jobs—			Remarks
		1910	1920	1930	
Caucasian (including Portuguese, Spanish, and Puerto Rican).	(a) Half were born in Hawaii. (b) Half about 20 years.....	30.1	42.9	59	(a) Secured positions largely through early entrepreneurs. (b) Secured positions through better training, education, and friends.
Hawaiian.....	Aboriginal.....	21.4	30.7	57	Chiefly Government work and skilled trades.
Part-Hawaiian.....	30 years (native).....	41.6	50.4	51	Chiefly Government, skilled trades and clerical.
Chinese.....	41 years.....	25.8	26.7	51	Many merchants, Government positions and clerical.
Japanese.....	25 years.....	15.4	26.8	40	Many merchants and skilled tradesmen.
Filipino and others.....	12 years.....	5.8	7	

"Preferred jobs" referred to in the foregoing table include such employment as the professions, the subprofessions, good clerical positions, good government

posts including appointive and elective jobs, the better skilled trades, and operative and administrative jobs. They are jobs that we compete for and usually look upon as desirable as compared with lowlier labor and less agreeable posts.

The last segregations of real and personal property ownerships by race was made in 1930 by the Territorial Treasurer. At that year such reporting was discontinued. But the report for that year is shown in part below.

Gross assessed value of real property of taxpayers for the year 1930, by races, and average length of time in Hawaii

[This does not include Government lands]

Taxpayers	Average length of time in Hawaii as of 1930	Real property		Percentage
		Number of taxpayers	Assessed values	
	Years			
Corporations, firms, etc.		1, 443	\$141, 057, 034	53. 97
Anglo-Saxons	80	5, 810	52, 881, 907	20. 23
Hawaiians and part Hawaiian	(1)	8, 223	23, 851, 034	9. 12
Portuguese and Spanish	40	3, 944	15, 055, 328	5. 76
Chinese	41	3, 070	15, 499, 245	5. 80
Japanese	25	4, 515	12, 889, 429	4. 90
Filipinos	12	46	105, 804	. 22
Total		27, 051	261, 339, 781	100. 00

¹ Aboriginal.

Comparative statement of assessed values of real property, by races, etc., of taxpayers, for the years

Year	Corporations, firms, etc.		Anglo-Saxons		Hawaiians		Portuguese and Spanish	
	Number tax-payers	Assessed value	Number tax-payers	Assessed value	Number tax-payers	Assessed value	Number tax-payers	Assessed value
1913	559	\$54, 827, 135	2, 623	\$20, 206, 828	5, 920	\$13, 015, 738	2, 205	\$3, 340, 654
1915	800	57, 531, 821	3, 200	20, 971, 922	5, 741	13, 701, 943	2, 332	3, 894, 078
1920	721	97, 321, 350	3, 315	29, 420, 235	6, 373	15, 712, 371	2, 763	6, 381, 814
1925	1, 437	136, 926, 102	4, 181	40, 375, 475	6, 845	20, 673, 138	3, 375	12, 314, 832
1929	1, 413	163, 661, 409	5, 496	50, 823, 339	8, 098	24, 245, 874	3, 968	14, 286, 575
1930	1, 443	141, 057, 034	5, 810	52, 881, 907	8, 223	23, 851, 034	3, 944	15, 055, 328

Year	Chinese		Japanese		Filipinos		Total
	Number tax-payers	Assessed value	Number tax-payers	Assessed value	Number tax-payers	Assessed value	
1913	755	\$1, 688, 510	777	\$684, 945			\$93, 853, 810
1915	889	2, 084, 356	845	1, 002, 203			99, 186, 323
1920	1, 263	4, 142, 944	1, 015	2, 259, 357			155, 238, 071
1925	2, 151	12, 039, 285	2, 889	7, 159, 167	11	\$20, 191	229, 508, 190
1929	2, 903	15, 547, 147	4, 106	11, 642, 089	35	83, 438	230, 294, 871
1930	3, 070	15, 499, 245	4, 515	12, 889, 429	46	105, 804	261, 339, 781

The above tables show how the group have gained in number and value of real-estate holdings as the years of residence have increased. The Anglo-Saxons have resided in Hawaii longer than any other immigrant group. They came early in the nineteenth century; they were here at the time of the great mahele or division of lands in 1848.

Individuals of all races now own in fee about one-half the total non-government land in Hawaii.

There follows a statement of the number and value of the real-estate transfers of title taking place during the past year 1945.

Real-estate transactions for the Territory of Hawaii by racial classification during the calendar year 1945

	Number of transactions	Value
Hawaiian.....	334	\$1,390,425
Chinese.....	901	8,865,606
Japanese.....	1,337	8,382,558
Korean.....	178	2,015,100
Filipino.....	264	1,496,699
All others.....	2,996	24,197,790
Total.....	6,061	45,348,178

This table indicates that there is relatively extensive buying and selling of real estate being carried on in Hawaii at present, and all groups participate in it.

Take any immigrant group. Nearly all came as penniless and ignorant but willing laborers. The figures establish that the longer the group has been in Hawaii, the farther the individuals have advanced up the scale of employment, property ownership, and success. This is presented as evidence of equality of opportunity for all, a basic American quality of this political division of our country.

Respectfully submitted.

ROY C. KESNER,

President, Retail Board, Chamber of Commerce of Honolulu.

EXHIBIT 72A. PRESENTED BY COL. ADNA G. CLARKE

The World War II activities of the American Legion posts, Department of Hawaii, are unique. The members of—

Post No. 6, Schofield Barracks, composed of Regular Army men, were on active duty as such.

Post No. 9, Fox-Coronet (Hickam Field), composed of Air Corps men were likewise on active duty as such.

Post No. 12, Capt. Willard D. Murphy (Fort Shafter), also Regular Army men, were also on active duty as such.

Post No. 21, Midway Island, all on active duty.

Post No. 22, United States Engineers in Honolulu, all on active duty.

Post No. 23, Wake Island, all on active duty.

Post No. 24, Pearl Harbor (civilian employees), all on active duty.

Post No. 25, Johnson Island, all on active duty.

The members of Posts No. 1, Honolulu; No. 10, Woodrow Wilson; No. 11, Kau Tom (Chinese); No. 13, Diamond Head; No. 15, Jose Rizal (Filipino); No. 16, Choy-Lee (Korean); No. 17, John R. Rowe (Hawaiian); No. 19, Jane Delano (women); all Honolulu posts functioned through Legion headquarters or went directly to their previously assigned emergency defense duty.

The members of Rural Oahu and outside island posts: No. 2, Kauai; No. 3, Hilo; No. 5, Waialua; No. 8, Wailuku; No. 14, Molokai; No. 18, Ewa; No. 20, Kona, were all actively engaged in defense work in their immediate communities, except such members as happened to be in Honolulu who reported to Legion headquarters at McCully Street and Kapiolani Avenue.

The Legion is, and of right should be, proud of the way its members answered again their country's call and it challenges any other of the 53 States, Territories, District of Columbia, and other overseas departments (except the Philippine Department not heard from) to show a better record of service in any emergency.

We in the Hawaiian Department have sometimes felt deeply the fact that we have not been treated on an exact parity with continental departments, although there has never been a time when our membership did not exceed one or more of the States.

We might even suggest "that the stone that was rejected by the builders has become the head of the corner."

ADNA G. CLARKE,

Colonel, United States Army Retired, Past Department Commander and National Executive Committeeman, Hawaii.

THE AMERICAN LEGION

DEPARTMENT OF HAWAII, HONOLULU, T. H.

THE AMERICAN LEGION GOES TO WAR

The American Legion and the members of other veteran organizations under its leadership again, Sunday, December 7, 1941, went to war.

Within an hour from the time the chief of police had broadcast for its assistance between three and four hundred members of the Legion as well as Spanish-American War veterans and Veterans of Foreign Wars had assembled at the American Legion Clubhouse at Kapiolani and McCully Streets and effected a provisional organization consisting of a headquarters detachment and four provisional companies and was dispatching individuals, squads, platoons, and companies on every conceivable kind of defense emergency duty.

In the absence of the department commander who was on duty under fire at Pearl Harbor, the headquarters detachment under the command of a past department commander consisted of two retired colonels, one retired captain, three past department commanders, an executive of the O. R. & L. Co., the outstanding American Legionnaire of Japanese ancestry who had served as a first sergeant of Capt. Howard Worralls Company in World War No. 1, a retired first sergeant famous as an AAU athletic director, a leading attorney frequently called upon by the Legion to deliver patriotic addresses, a runner from each company, a Hawaiian comrade of Maui Post, No. 8, acting as adjutant and dispatcher who stayed on duty continuously for 72 hours, and other key Legionnaires.

Even before the completion of the provisional organization, two truckloads of men had been sent to police headquarters to report for assignment by the chief of police for guard duty at wharves and docks, around public buildings, over public utilities, and other vital defense areas; a squad under the command of a past department vice-commander and a former commander of Kau-Tom Post, whose membership is composed of veterans of Chinese ancestry, had been dispatched to assist in fighting fires at King and McCully Streets and at Luna-lilo School, caused by falling projectiles, believed at the time to be bombs, to prevent looting and to assist in rescuing and evacuating injured persons and in salvaging property.

In this account all reference to race must be understood to be solely for the purpose of showing the cosmopolitan character of the American Legion and the solidarity of Hawaii's citizenry. All are of course Americans.

By 4 p. m. every man had been assigned to a relief of 8 hours each, or attached to headquarters to answer urgent SOS calls of every possible kind or description, all reliefs had been directed to find their own food, suitable clothing for night duty and using their own transportation if necessary, to report to a specific post or station at 4 p. m., midnight, or 8 a. m., December 8, depending upon the relief—first, second or third—to which they had been assigned. Besides the large numbers of men sent to police headquarters for guard duty, detachments of three reliefs each were sent to guard water reservoir extending all the way from Wilhelmina Rise to Alewa Heights.

Early Sunday a squad of four men were sent in answer to a call for professional advice to investigate what was reported to be an unexploded bomb; the bomb proved to be a dud that had produced a sizable hole in the ground. It was properly guarded until disposed of by proper authorities. (The dud mentioned was a dud projectile.)

During the early morning hours of Monday, December 8, an agitated citizen called for Legionnaires to quell a disturbance a few blocks from the clubhouse. The report of the comrade in charge of detail, a member of Omaha (Nebr.) Post, reads as follows: "A woman, middle-aged, fully undressed, with palms of hands together, same pointing heavenward, mumbling like a feeble-minded person. Reported as insane and turned over to military authorities at the scene for observation and investigation."

Sunday afternoon a call from civilian-defense headquarters was received for a detail to collect all high explosives from individuals, huts, firms, or corporations who had been licensed by proper authorities to have and use such explosives.

An organization directed by the above-mentioned attorney at law, assisted by a past post commander of Honolulu Post, and the above-mentioned first sergeant of Japanese ancestry worked most of Sunday night using the office personnel of the attorney preparing and mimeographing forms to be filled out in triplicate,

to insure the return of such high explosives to their legal owners or to enable them to be compensated therefor later; in securing a detail of expert powdermen from among Red Hill defense workers; and in mobilizing the required interpreters. The outstanding accomplishments of this group on Monday, December 8, will be related under Monday's activities.

MONDAY, DECEMBER 8, 1941

Soon after 8 a. m. a flying squadron of 33 cars or trucks, driven by Legionnaires or other volunteers accompanied by a Japanese interpreter and an expert powderman from Red Hill, left Legion headquarters with the address and/or location of some 350 persons or firms who had been legally authorized and licensed to have and use explosives.

Personnel of the highway department of the city and county had worked most of Sunday night providing a spot map showing the probable location of explosives and the address of the licensed owner.

By 4:30 p. m. 350 calls had been made and large and small quantities of explosives and caps had been collected and deposited in a safe place under proper guard to await final disposition. Much of the explosive collected was in an advanced state of deterioration and would have been extremely dangerous to handle by other than experts as our Red Hill powder men.

In every case of confiscation receipts had been made in triplicate on legal forms; one delivered to the owner, one retained by the Legion, and one turned in to constituted authorities.

Two valuable non-Legionnaire assistants to this powder detail were Jack Guard, Jr., who drove a truck, and Peter Dillingham, who served as a valuable messenger and orderly.

At 8:15 a. m. a detachment of 30 Legionnaires were dispatched to St. Louis College to perform very arduous labor all day in helping to transform that college into an Army hospital.

A detail of three Catholic comrades were dispatched at their request to relieve three others who had been similarly selected on December 7 to guard the home of the bishop at 1043 Spencer Street, he being absent on the mainland.

A detail for special duty as guards was sent to pier No. 13 direct from Legion headquarters.

A detachment of four men, three Filipinos, and one Hawaiian was provided to work as guards for the United States engineers.

A squad of nine men, all but the leader Filipino comrades, was furnished as a guard at the Children's Hospital.

Three additional Legionnaires were provided for special duty at City Hall.

Three men, a colonel reserve, a Dane by birth who had helped establish Fort McKinley on the slope of Diamond Head in 1898 while a member of the United States Volunteer Engineers; another Hawaiian by birth, a former captain of the Hawaiian National Guard; and a third, race unknown to this writer, probably Irish, a very active Legionnaire, were detailed on permanent duty at the urgent request of the Territorial treasurer to guard the Territory's millions during office hours when the safe was open.

A squad of 10 commanded by a past department commander of the American Legion, a high-ranking Territorial official, was detailed for duty at the central fire station.

All of the above detachments were in addition to the scores of others that were still functioning under the chief of police as guards of essential defense institutions and areas and of water reservoirs.

Monday night was a hectic period at Legion headquarters. Calls for new details were coming in especially from Queen's, Kapiolani, and Leahi, and the children's hospitals.

Rifle and machine-gun fire kept everyone alert and anxious. The clubhouse is a single-wall frame building. The car of the executive on duty during the early hours of Tuesday had two bullet holes in it when he went to use it at 8 a. m.

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 9, 1941

By 8 a. m. the third relief of all guards had been posted.

A detachment of 12 men for duty at Queen's Hospital was secured and dispatched. A similar detail of 6 men for Kapiolani Maternity Hospital and 4 men for Leahi Tubercular Home was also furnished. These comrades did all kinds

of duty from guarding the precious blood bank to quieting the nerves of anxious patients.

These hospital details were continued throughout the week.

All day persons who had ammunition and explosives in their possession were turning them in to Legion headquarters and the "powder detail" continued to function the rest of the week.

By Tuesday noon word had been received that many of the Legion guards could be replaced by other more permanent agencies.

Unforeseen trouble began to multiply.

Legionnaires who had been using their own cars and providing their own gas, and many of them could ill afford it, could no longer get gas as its sale had been stopped. Arrangements were made by which they could get a few gallons each where urgently needed.

Many of the members were on essential defense work which had been only temporarily suspended and were being called back to their regular jobs. Some others were breadwinners whose families needed their help. A few unused to long hours of night guard duty in the rain were showing signs of the strain. One member on special and extra duty had had his car badly damaged allegedly by an Arm truck while returning at night from Red Hill delivering one of our most efficient powder detail.

One Filipino comrade called up and after apologizing for quitting his post without being properly relieved while he went to a telephone, said that he had been on post in the "jungle" of Nuuanu Valley over a water reservoir for 26 hours and asked if he could be relieved. He was.

The department adjutant and his assistant did yeoman service throughout the week; furnishing information, food, material for black-out; receiving and storing arms and ammunition; contacting civilian defense headquarters; securing identification cards, arm bands, and car stickers, and in countless other ways helping to keep the headquarters functioning.

Post No. 1's own Boy Scout troop No. 36 was constantly on duty day and night preparing and serving sandwiches, coffee, and acting as messengers and orderlies. Four scouts daily accompanied our detail to Queen's Hospital to serve as orderlies. Miss Louise Teasley, second-class Girl Scout, and Mr. Krohn, her grandfather, were on duty each day helping to prepare and serve sandwiches and coffee.

A visiting comrade, coach of a mainland football team marooned in Honolulu by the war, reported daily to Legion headquarters. He was given a specific detail for himself and the members of his team. The team players were subsequently employed as special police and United States engineer guards.

A letter received from the director of civilian defense, thanking the Legion, contains the following statement: "As you know, all my shift directors are American Legionnaires, and their handling of this extremely difficult position has been exemplary and most praiseworthy. Two other Legionnaires have carried out instructions on gas masks and gas protection in many of our units. They have done a very fine job."

Scores of other Legionnaires who reported direct to relief duty are not included in this report of activities initiated from Legion headquarters. Their exploits make an equally thrilling story which will be told later.

After a consultation with the manager of the board of water supply, the chief of police, and the director of civilian defense, it was decided to declare a general demobilization of the provisional organization that had been effected Sunday morning but to keep headquarters open on a 24-hour basis and to furnish certain details including all hospital details and members on duty at defense headquarters. All others were informed that the Legion's main emergency objective had been accomplished and that as of 4 p. m. all were released with the thanks of the Legion and the assurance that they had done a big job in a big way.

Headquarters continued to function, finding and detailing comrades, who were not otherwise necessarily employed, to hospitals and other special jobs.

At a special meeting of the department executive committee held on Friday at 4 p. m. at the clubhouse, it was decided to close out active participation as of Saturday, December 13, and to appoint a committee to draft rules of procedure for another acute emergency, and so the Legion's participation in the first week of World War II became history.

Names of individual Legionnaires are purposely not given in this account because each in his own way played a noble part and obviously all cannot be mentioned by name.

Although signed for purpose of identification, the author of this account desires to remain anonymous.

ADNA G. CLARKE,
*Past Department Commander and
National Executive Committeeman of Hawaii,
Provisional Commander.*

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT TO THE AMERICAN LEGION GOES TO WAR DECEMBER 7, 1941

This supplemental report of American Legion activities December 7-12, 1941, is for the purpose of making of record the names of Legionnaires intentionally omitted from the published report. A roster of all who reported at Legion headquarters as far as it has been possible to obtain them is herewith attached.

PARAGRAPH 2

The official call for Legionnaires was broadcast over both radio stations KGU and KGMB at 11:10 a. m. December 7, 1941, in the following words: "All American Legionnaires report at American Legion Clubhouse, Kapiolani and McCully immediately." This message was filed by Lieutenant Liu, police department.

The company officers were: First company: Capt. Mark Clement, First Lt. Marion Cato, Second Lt. Y. C. Quon. Second company: Capt. A. C. Young. Third company: ———. Fourth company: Capt. George Baker, Lt. Henry O'Sullivan.

PARAGRAPH 3

The men referred to in paragraph 3 were:

1. Col. Adna G. Clarke, retired past department commander.
 2. Lt. Col. John D. Kilpatrick, retired.
 3. Capt. Fred R. Wolfe, retired (not a Legionnaire).
 4. Lester Marks, past department commander.
 5. Henry O'Sullivan, past department commander.
 6. Irwin Spalding, past department commander.
 7. Harold Dillingham, executive, O. R. L. Co.
 8. Harry Ozaki, first sergeant, World War I.
 9. Everett C. Corn, retired master sergeant.
 10. Urban E. Wild, attorney and orator.
- Names of runners not of record:
11. Henry Shim, Post No. 8, adjutant and dispatcher.
 12. Phil Cass, department judge advocate.
 13. Jack Leiton, department adjutant.
 14. H. E. Podmore, Charles T. T. Yap.

PARAGRAPH 4

The past vice department commander referred to was Albert F. Lee.

PARAGRAPH 7

Names of members of detail not recorded.

PARAGRAPH 8

Comrade Michael E. Bannon, Omaha Post, and Francis T. Ogasto.

PARAGRAPHS 9-14

Names of all members of this important detail are contained in Comrade Urban Wild's report.

PARAGRAPHS 16-24

See list of names attached.

PARAGRAPHS 25 AND 26

H. E. Podmore.

This is a partial roster of members of the American Legion in Hawaii who reported for duty December 7-13, 1941, at Legion headquarters, McCully Street and Kapiolani Avenue:

ADNA G. CLARKE,
Colonel, Retired, Commanding.

Aalona, Samuel	Cook, Earl	Hicks, M. L.
Abraham, Y.	Cooper, Harry	Higashihara, S.
Aden, Robert	Cordoba, Grabino	Higuchi, Tahichi
Ah Nee, Eddie	Corn, Everett C.	Hiranaka, H.
Aila, Louis	Cotad, Narciso	Holmes, Charles
Albert, Gregorio	Dandsotheer, Henry	Horikawa, T.
Albarracin, Aguilino	Davis, Frederick	Hosa, Roman
Allen, Jack	Dela Cruz, Vincent	Howland, L. P.
Alperto, Andres	Delmarndo, E.	Hung, Kau
Amera, Julian	Deva, Bedexto	Ige, Bukichiro
Amor, Simeon	Dias, Joseph A.	Iokia, Charles
Anderson, E. T.	Dillingham, Harold	Iokua, Joseph
Ariz, F. F.	Dillion, Maurice	Isokane, Matsuji
Asportino, Fredrico	Dimento, Manuel F.	Itamura, David
Au, Koon Yee	Dobelleros, Rofino	Jackson, Ben E.
Austin, H. A. R.	Doi, Hatsuichi	Jorgenson, Jorgen
Austria, Bernado	Dowdy, Joseph W.	Kahili, Abraham
Ah Nin, Steward	Edwards, Kendall	Kaihe, David
Badog, Juan	Eiseman, A. W.	Kaipo, Adam
Balacuit, Apolonio	Eldon, John A.	Kalavaro, Domingo
Bannon, Michael E.	Ellington, Richmond	Kaluakini, Joseph
Beatty, T. R.	Enos, George	Kam, Fong
Beckley, Benjamin	Esportino, Jose	Kam, Sam
Bishop, Joe	Feliciano, Paul	Kamai, Joseph K.
Bishaw, A. R.	Fernandez, Francisco	Kamakau, Sam
Brash, Lionel	Fitzgerald, Don	Kanikua, Gabriel
Bradewell, W.	Fletcher, Lee	Kaohu, Mana
Blim, M. F.	Flores, William	Kapoi, Sam Aalona
Bona, Domaso	Foster, Henry	Katsumoto, H.
Boyd, Robert M.	Freitas, Joseph J.	Kau, Wong
Buan, Antonio	Freitas, William	Kauhane, Joseph, Sr.
Buna, Agapito	Frost, Sherman W.	Kauhane, Aki
Burton, L. R.	Fukuda, Henry	Kaukani, J.
Cabral, John	Gabriel, Crispulo	Kearns, Jack
Camara, Louis	Garcia, Timateo	Kearns, Russel
Camp, H. W.	Garfin, Florentine	Keli, Daniel
Canceliar, Guillermo	Garrett, J. W.	Kelihoomaluu, Moody
Carido, Jose	Gay, Lawrence	Keohlou, Joe
Carr, Clarence	Gilman, James	Kendall, Edward
Carrilho, J. S.	Git, Pablo	Kilpatrick, John D.
Cass, Phil	Glover, A. M.	Kimura, Gunishi
Catingun, Rufo	Gonzales, Benito	Kin, Kun You
Cato, Marion A.	Goo, Yee	Kirao, F.
Catora, Pedro	Green, Geo.	Koahou, John
Cedarloff, V.	Galinzoga	Kobayashi
Chan, C.	Hano, William J.	Kopa, George K.
Chang, Ah Min	Haran, Thomas	Koide, Sukeichi
Ching, Ah Kul	Harmon	Krauss, George
Ching, William	Harrigan, H. N.	Kukona
Chock, Pai	Hassel, John	Kwan Mo Kim
Chun, Sam Fow	Houla, Leslie	Landford, Wm.
Clarke, Adna G.	Hawakawa, Totaro	Leanodro, A. J.
Clifford, R. K.	Heavalin, Walter	Lee, Albert F.
Cliver, Edwin E.	Hermanson, Karl	Lee, Choy
Cody, M. T.	Hernandez, Antone	Lee, Chun
Collins, Louis	Hernandez, Karl	Lee, Chung K.
Congio, Bonifacia	Hibbetts, Hugh M.	Lee, Pai

Lee, Sha Luke	Nolan, M. W.	Schaffer, N. B.
Lee, Vernon	Nylen, W. L.	Schombach, Daniel
Leiton, Jack	O'Brien, Allen	Sebastian, Carlos
Liana, George	Ocamp, Pedro	Sebree, G. O., Lt.
Liborcio, Santos	Ogasto, F. T.	Sequoia, Domias
Lindo, J. C.	Oku, William	Shaefer, Rose H.
Lohoy, Ciprian	Orth, Fred	Sherman, Marsh
Lomolho, Julian	Omega	Shim, Henry
Long, Albert	Ortiz, Celestina	Silao, Filepe
Look, Dock	Osballas, Permin	Simeon, George K.
Lopez, John	O'Sullivan, Henry	Simpson
Louis, Valencia	Ozaki, Harry	Smith, Homer D.
Luci, Venancio	Pablo, Christobal	Smith, Joseph
Lui, Joseph H.	Paka, John	Solomon, Tommy
Lum, Kong Chew	Palmiro, John	Somuda, G.
Lum, K. Y.	Pang, George	Souza, M.
Lum, Lai	Park, Hee Duck	Souza, Perfecto
Lumio, Lucas	Park, Yuen	Spalding, Irwin
Macallinao, Juan	Parks, Alejandro	Stephens, William O.
MacFarland, Sergeant	Parks, H. D.	Stone, Daniel
Makakoa, James	Paskua, Alexander	Suzuki, Kozuke
Makinano, Baselio	Perdew, George W.	Theurer, George
Marks, Lester	Perry, Jack	Tite, Elmer
Marrazo, J. B.	Peters, William	Todoc, Miguel, Sr.
Martinez, B. C.	Pimento, M.	Tong, Yuan
Masaki, Danny	Pinao, John	Toomey, Sam, Sr.
Mason, Raymond	Pinaridondo, Cayteno	Turner, F. W.
Mato, Chuta	Pinheiro, Dan	Valenciano, Luis
McCarthy, Fred	Pires, Thomas	Vasconsallos, L.
McCully, Edwin J.	Plaso, Leon	Villanuva, Joaquim
Meinecke, William H.	Plunkett, D. M.	Villaras, Pedro
Meriam, Pedro	Podmore, H. E.	Vilmonte, Alcantro
Miguel, Teodoro	Ponghah, D. H.	Wakinekona, George H.
Miles, H. W.	Poulos, Alexander	Warde, Louis J.
Moffett, H. M.	Quinn, Hugh D.	Warrier, R. G.
Moldenhauer, Henry	Ramos, Antonio	Watanabe, Kamigi
Montano, Nikano	Ramos, Silvestri	Webb, H. B.
Morales, Louis Revera	Rapos, Rambido	Whan, Joe S.
Moriyama, Clement	Rekaparanka, Buenbenoto	White, T. H.
Moriyama, James	Resna, Julian	Whitson, D. J.
Mumford, Preston	Reuther, H. G.	Wild, Urban
Murakami	Ricard, Captain	Wilds, Birch B.
Myers, C. R.	Rivira, Angelo	Wing Wah Hoy
Naganni, H.	Rizal, Dr. Jose	Wolf, Fred, Sr.
Natalino, Tergar	Roberts, L. L.	Wolfe, Fred R.
Natto, P.	Robinson, O. W.	Woo, Philip
Ng, Kemp Young	Roston, Pastor	Wrenshell, Richard
Ng, Sau Bew	Rycroft, W.	Yatomi, K.
Nihoa, E. K.	Sabis, Francisco	Yee, Chun Wan
Nishikida, James	Sakai, Tetsu	Young, Kong Tai
Nodado, Maredo	Samparyni, Pedro	Young, Yet Shui
Noh, Richard	Sanborne, Paul B.	Ysabel, Eugenio

EXHIBIT 73A. PRESENTED BY RICHARD KAGEYAMA

[Newspaper clippings, 1941. American Institute of Public Opinion—America Speaks]

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII IS APPROVED IN MAINLAND POLL

Herewith are presented details on the recent mainland poll on Hawaiian statehood, additional to those published in the Star-Bulletin, January 11.

(By Dr. George Gallup, director, American Institute of Public Opinion)

PRINCETON, N. J., January 11.—Will Hawaii become the forty-ninth State? Without much attention being given the news in continental United States, the

voters of Hawaii on November 5 decided by a plebiscite vote of 2 to 1 to ask for statehood.

From now on, Hawaiian citizens interested in statehood will place their case before Congress in bills and resolutions.

While the question of statehood for Hawaii has not been widely discussed outside of the islands themselves, a survey just completed by the American Institute of Public Opinion provides interesting evidence that—at the present time—a majority of voters with opinions on the question think Hawaii should be admitted to the Union.

Not since 1912, when Arizona and New Mexico were admitted, has a new star been added to the American flag.

The institute's question, put to men and women in a cross-section of the electorate in every State, was as follows: "Would you favor admitting Hawaii into the Union as a State?"

The replies were:

	<i>Percent</i>
Yes -----	48
No -----	23
Undecided or no opinion -----	29

It is interesting to note that—among those with definite opinions—statehood was approved by slightly more than 2 to 1, or almost the same majority found in the island's plebiscite last November.

STATEHOOD ISSUE INVOLVED

Hawaii has, of course, become the mid-Pacific key to United States defenses. It is the site of a large Army camp and one of the principal stations of the United States fleet. Through fleet maneuvers, travel, reading, and films the American people have become more conscious of their island outpost than they have been in many a year.

The common attitude of those who favor statehood is that the Territory is "already practically a State, and the people should have the right to a larger voice in their own government."

Taking the opposite position are those who fear that "it might fall under Japanese control because of the birth rate of Japanese in the islands" or for other causes, and also some who think the islands "too far away" to belong to the Federal system.

The question of possible future dominance of Hawaii by the Japanese via the birth rate was well aired in the islands' plebiscite last November.

The Honolulu Star-Bulletin traced the notion of "Japanese dominance" to a sociological "myth" of 20 years ago that Japanese in Hawaii would continue to increase in geometric proportion to the other islanders, reaching "47 percent" of the Hawaiian electorate by 1940.

Far from increasing at this rate, however, the Japanese birth rate in the islands has steadily fallen ever since 1918, and is today "less than that for Hawaiians, Part-Hawaiians, and other racial groups," the Star-Bulletin said.

Whether Hawaii will achieve statehood in the near future is, of course, a speculative matter. But the relatively cordial reception given the idea by voters in the "States" suggests that Americans may hear much more of the question.

UNITED STATES FOR HAWAII STATE—GALLUP POLLS MAINLAND

(By Dr. George Gallup, director, American Institute of Public Opinion)

NEW YORK, January 11.—Attracted by the widespread interest in the recent Hawaii plebiscite on statehood, the American Institute of Public Opinion has made a Nation-wide survey to determine the attitude of mainland voters on this question.

The result was that more than 2 to 1 among those who had opinions were in favor of admission of Hawaii as the forty-ninth State.

The question asked by the Gallup Poll interviewers was this: "Would you favor admitting Hawaii into the Union as a State?"

The replies were: Yes, 48 percent; no, 23 percent; undecided, 29 percent.

It is interesting to note that those with opinions gave the same majority as was recorded in Hawaii, 2 to 1.

The attitude expressed by those in favor of admitting the Territory as a State was, "Hawaii is already practically a State and the people should have a larger voice in government."

Little difference by sections was noted, although the west coast was in favor.

Whether Hawaii achieves statehood in the near future is, of course, speculative. But the relatively cordial reception given the idea suggests that Americans may hear much more of the question.

The Gallup Poll on Hawaiian statehood was instituted purely on the initiative of the survey organization, and had no inception among proponents of statehood in Hawaii.

The survey was organized on the basis of widespread interest on the mainland preceding and following the plebiscite in the Territory. The Gallup organization decided that the national poll would be interesting to newspaper readers and proceeded to take it.

EXHIBIT 73B. PRESENTED BY RICHARD KAGEYAMA

[Newspaper clipping from Honolulu Star-Bulletin, January 5, 1946]

HEARINGS ON STATEHOOD—THEIR SIGNIFICANCE

The congressional hearings on statehood, which open in Honolulu Monday, are of special significance and importance.

They demonstrate a realization by the legislative branch of our Government that the time has come to treat the statehood question conclusively.

They are evidence of a marked friendliness to statehood on the part of many Members of Congress, and a distinct advance, in the past few years, of Hawaii's long statehood campaign.

Congressional visits are no novelty to Hawaii—though never in any one session of Congress have we had anything like a majority of its membership familiar with Hawaii conditions and problems.

Visits of congressional groups to study statehood have not been frequent, but they are not new. There have been several such. And a few years ago a joint committee of the upper and lower Houses made a trip to the islands, held extensive hearings and embodied a generally favorable statement in a long report made a part of the records of Congress.

To date, the reports of congressional committees, while always cordial to the Territory, and sympathetic with its aspiration to become a State, have been inconclusive. They have suggested that while statehood is a noble objective, the time had not arrived to make it an immediate realization.

Now comes a new group, a subcommittee of the House Committee on the Territories, for a new study.

It has all of the benefits of past investigations and discussions, with Hawaii in position to advance new arguments on behalf of statehood.

For the first time in this campaign for statehood extending over the entire Territorial period, the Department of the Interior, in whose jurisdiction the Territory falls, has made a positive and emphatic recommendation for immediate action.

Secretary Harold L. Ickes, a few days ago issued a statement on behalf of his Department, declaring that Hawaii is entitled to statehood now.

This is no qualified recommendation for eventual statehood or for ultimate statehood. It is a declaration in favor of elevation of Hawaii to a State as rapidly as the legal formalities, one after another, can be completed.

The statehood hearings thus open on Monday at Iolani Palace, with the impetus given by strong, explicit advice from the Department which has handled Hawaii's civilian governmental affairs, and its general administration—advice that the Territory is ready for statehood.

World War II projected Hawaii into the spotlight. For a time it seemed that the war might retard statehood. The opposite has proved true.

First, the people of the Territory generally proved themselves capable of sustaining the first tremendous shock of surprise assault and thereafter of carrying forward the heavy responsibility and duty laid on the civilian community.

Hawaii as a Territory, the people of Hawaii as the human elements of that Territory have been given repeated unstinted, and significant commendation by the commanders of the armed forces.

Their industry, loyalty, cooperation, and ability to gear civilian effort to the urgent needs of war have been, again and again, made the theme of public statements and letters by high officers of the Army and the Navy.

Second, World War II gave a unique and unparalleled opportunity for the young men of all races here to show that the "melting pot" is no myth; that good Americans, stanch Americans, fighting Americans, are bred here out of the bloods of all the races in these islands.

Not one racial element of the many which compose our half-million people failed under the terrific test of war's impact and war's demands. And the American-born citizens of the very race most suspect in some quarters—the Japanese race—answered whispers or open words of distrust with work of notable loyalty and value on the home front; and with deeds of extraordinary bravery and military skill on the battlefields and in the jungles all the way from north Africa to the far Pacific islands.

The arguments for statehood will be marshaled, one by one, before the House congressional committee next week.

Some of them deal with material things—guaranty of fair treatment for island business and industries on the same basis as fair treatment is given to the States.

Some of them deal with guaranty that the Constitution of the United States shall extend its protective hand to the people of Hawaii as to the people of continental United States. (Within the past 3 weeks the argument has been advanced before the Supreme Court of the United States that the people of a Territory are not entitled to the same degree of constitutional safeguards as the people of a State. Here is a theory of law which is nothing less than a continued threat so long as it goes unchecked.)

Some of the arguments will deal with the promise of statehood implied in the annexation of this Territory to the Union in 1898, preceded as it was by many years of varied negotiation in which the National Government openly sought to bring the Hawaiian Islands into the Federal Union.

Our congressional visitors know already that our campaign for statehood is in no sense rebellion against the treatment hitherto accorded Hawaii.

We are not setting up a long list of grievances alleged to have brought a half million citizens into acute discontent.

We are not running a high fever of hatred or posing as the stricken victims of chronic and gross persecution or neglect by Congress or the Federal departments.

The visiting Congressmen will find no such claims or atmosphere.

What they will find is a community completely loyal to the United States and extremely desirous of more closely identifying itself with the Union of States; a community believing that it has made a definite success of its present large degree of local self-government and desiring a larger degree; a community which for four decades has been in training to become a State and believes itself ready now to carry the responsibilities of a State.

This is no "crusade"—it is a reasoned, temperate and determined purpose—the same purpose that has animated the many Territories from the Mississippi west to win for themselves entry into the Union of States.

In that purpose we have strong confidence we shall receive the support of Congressmen who come to see for themselves whether or not our claims be true and our arguments be sound.

The inquiry which this committee of the House undertakes beginning Monday is not the final step for Congress. Its report must go before the full Committee on Territories, then before the House itself. Then there must be similar Senate proceedings.

That does not detract from the signal importance of the House inquiry here. To a noteworthy extent, the case for statehood which will be set forth here will determine the future course of the statehood cause.

The hearings, unless otherwise decided, are completely public. They will be held in the throne room of Iolani Palace, the Territorial capitol.

The setting itself is of special significance, for here once an island queen sat in majesty, here a branch of the Territorial legislature sits in periodic session. Old Iolani Palace has seen the changing panorama from Hawaiian monarchy to revolution, to provisional government, to the Republic of Hawaii, to the Territory of Hawaii.

The people of Honolulu have an exceptional opportunity both to observe a committee of Congress in action and to listen to the discussion on an event of

national importance—the plea for admission as a State of a group of Pacific islands which not many decades ago, as time goes in history, were a part of aboriginal Polynesia.

EXHIBIT 73C. PRESENTED BY RICHARD KAGNYAMA

[Newspaper clipping from Honolulu Advertiser, March 6, 1945]

SENATE ACCORD ON STATEHOOD FINALLY GAINED—KAMOKILA VOTES "NO," OTHER SENATORS FAVOR PETITION TO CONGRESS

(By Dorothy Benyas)

Much ado about representation of outside islands in a proposed constitutional convention made a second hearing on senate concurrent resolutions for statehood a vehement exchange of opinions about "control" and postponing action until Hawaii's fighting men return from battle fronts. After an hour's commotion, the committee of the whole adopted the resolution memorializing Congress to grant Hawaii statehood. Senator Kamokila Campbell was the lone opponent to the measure.

Senator Harold W. Rice had offered an amendment to the resolution that would give the proposed constitutional convention 48 delegates from Oahu and 52 from the other islands, elected by representative districts. A provision for 15 delegates at large remained unchanged. His objection to the original proposal, upheld by other senators from the outside islands, was that Oahu would control the convention through a numerical preponderance of delegates elected by the fourth and fifth representative districts. His amendment finally passed by a show of hands.

SPIRITED EXCHANGES

But before the spirited finale, an interchange of viewpoints gave the senate chamber a semblance of an arena. Senator Akana pleaded with her colleagues of the outer islands to "be fair." Either they were for statehood or not. Senator Gomes said the majority of States in the Union have not had reapportionment for over 100 years and the United States Senate had refused to apportion both Houses. It's unfortunate that the Territory is not one piece of land, otherwise this problem of fair representation would never arise, he said. "You may as well disenfranchise the outer islands and give Honolulu control," he added.

Senator Akana urged a system of checks and balances as a just solution of the problem. Senator Crozier said the outside island members had always been fair to all. Oahu members would have reason to kick if an attempt was made to move the capital to another island, he contended. Senator W. H. Heen said he thought the amendment was unfair because it did not follow the principles of American government. He moved to amend the amendment before the meeting. Senator Capellas didn't think the suggested change was fair. "Senator Heen thinks Oahu is entitled to a larger representation," he said. "If it's a case of population, I'd like to be a delegate at large."

"UNFAIR," SAYS AKANA

Senator Heen maintained that the basis of the amendment was unfair. "And you know it, too," he said. "The majority of registered voters should have a higher degree of representation. With a minority of the total population, you are allowing yourself a majority representation."

Senator Akana insisted again they should be fair. "If you elect 25 members at large that doesn't mean all of them would represent Oahu," she said. "It could be split up by political maneuver. I've been to political conventions. We're Americans, so let's go all the way and be fair. None of us from Oahu are trying to gyp you. Just give us our share."

Senator Silva commented that Senator Akana was contradictory in her remarks. The point is, eventually Oahu would elect two senators and one representative to Congress, he said. Senator Crozier said Senator Akana claimed that taxation is supposed to be representative but most taxes come from the outside islands, which do their share to support Oahu. "The delegates at large would all come from Oahu," he insisted.

Senator W. H. Heen dryly observed that he noticed the senate president and speaker of the house are from the outside islands. Senator Rice said it was not a fair time to judge the total voting population because many people of the outside districts came down here.

KAMOKILA GIVES VIEWS

Senator Campbell asked permission of chairman Francis K. Sylva to read aloud her statement, prepared in advance because she didn't want to be misquoted. She first quoted from an editorial in the afternoon newspaper as "basing her objections (to statehood) on racial grounds." "I want to correct this," she said. "I do not base my objections on that but on a matter proved to me in the last campaign. I was threatened by Japanese and Chinese voters and I don't mean aliens. I mean Japanese and Chinese in the sense that we speak of Hawaiians or Portuguese. We who have been campaigning here know we have to cater to the Japanese and Chinese vote but when we are forced to cater to any one group, I say Hawaii is in a very dangerous condition. We have no freedom of speech in Honolulu because of that. I am against trying to railroad this statehood legislation through at this time. I have talked to Members of Congress about it. Some of you here have never been to Congress. I told Congressmen in Washington that we have a ticklish situation here because of the position that Japanese and Chinese hold. Congressman Lex Green, chairman of the House Territorial Committee, who is retiring from Congress to run for Governor of Florida, told me Hawaii was probably ready for statehood but that Congress should hold statehood in abeyance until after the war. I am an American and I want statehood, yes, but I beg and appeal to everybody in Hawaii to give a thought to the boys who are fighting for us. They should have a say in the future of Hawaii. If you can't get together now on what you want, I say postpone the matter."

Senator Charles S. Silva disagreed with Senator Campbell's remarks and said he "resented" them. As an alibi, she was trying to hide behind the boys at the front, he charged. Senator W. H. Heen said, "We all appreciate the fact that Senator Campbell has very strong convictions and the courage to express them and we must admire that in her. However, I think she is mistaken in implying that the boys at the front are against statehood. There are many Chinese and Japanese boys at the front in combat. Many volunteered. The whole war is being fought to preserve various privileges under the American way of living, freedom of speech and all the other things. I feel the highest aspiration of every American citizen is to be a part of a sovereign state, not in a Territory more or less subservient to the wishes of Congress."

Senator Heen quoted a conversation he had with Secretary of Interior Ickes who was "amazed" because Hawaii didn't get statehood right away. "I told him there was a lot of opposition on account of the Japanese holding a large number of votes", he went on. "Mr. Ickes said it was a rotten argument. The record of the Americans of Japanese ancestry had made on battlefields goes to show that the AJA's were just as good as other Americans, no matter who their ancestors were. He thought Hawaii was entitled to statehood as soon as possible."

Senator Campbell repeated her stand, that she never said she was against statehood but asked only for postponement until the boys return. "I am not hiding behind the boys in battle," she said. "I only ask for equal rights. I am sure our American boys are entitled to say something about the future of Hawaii."

GOMES CITES VOTE

Senator Gomes quoted the results of the 1940 plebescite, the vote 2 to 1 for statehood. The boys at the front and their parents have already expressed themselves, he contended. President Capellas asked the senators to forget all ill feeling and anything offensive that might have been said so as to strive for harmony. "I hope no animosity or ill feeling will result from this fight on the floor," he said. "When we go out, let us go as friends." Chairman Sylva reassured him there would be no hard feelings. Senator Ernest N. Heen said he did not agree to the suggestion that there was any "split" in sentiment. He said he opposed statehood action formerly because of the way people were voting then, not according to race but according to economic control. "I see a vast change in the electorate now," he said. "Economic controls have been broken by the people themselves. The plantations no longer control the vote. The last election showed that." Senator Crozier said he was for postponement of action until after the war but since the racial issue came into the picture, he would change his vote on it. Senator Pedro voiced the same stand. A showing of hands then gave 14 to 1 vote for adoption.

EXHIBIT 73D. PRESENTED BY RICHARD KAGEYAMA

HAWAII STATEHOOD FAVORED

(Honolulu Star-Bulletin)

[From the Jacksonville Journal]

Florida, in observing the one hundredth anniversary of its becoming a State, might well pause to give thought to two United States Territories which have made major contributions to the winning of this war, and which stand today where Floridians stood a century ago.

Both Hawaii and Alaska have played major roles in this crisis, standing as bulwarks in the defense of the continental part of our Nation. Neither has ever had or wanted an independent national existence. Statehood is definitely in the cards for both.

One of the obstacles which has stood in Hawaii's path to statehood has been the large proportion of its population which consists of Americans of Japanese ancestry. But Riley H. Allen, editor of The Honolulu Star-Bulletin, and a keen observer of Hawaiian life for a quarter of a century, shows dramatically how this picture has been put in a new light by the war.

"The two great changes have come about as a result of World War II," he says. "First, the Americans of Japanese ancestry have made so fine a record in combat and in other wartime duties that it has become a matter of national recognition. Our One Hundredth Infantry Battalion and our Four Hundred and Forty-second Infantry Regiment—both of which are organizations almost entirely of Americans of Japanese ancestry, principally from Hawaii, were among the very best fighting in the European theater, and the One Hundredth Infantry Battalion has been called 'the most decorated unit in the American Army.'"

"The loyalty of these young Americans, and their readiness to face the enemy, not only in Europe but members of their own race, our Japanese enemy, has been well demonstrated.

"Second, the very large influx of war workers from the mainland has drastically changed the population situation here. Our population growth shows a greater increase in Caucasians than of any other race, and the percentage of our population of Japanese blood is dropping noticeably in the scale.

"These two things, separately and together, tend to remove the fear that should this become a State the predominant political influence will be Japanese and will be exercised racially."

Hawaii has highly developed wealth and resources, a high quality of public education, and makes a greater tax contribution to the Federal Government than some States. It has a long tradition of democratic government.

Alaska, with its huge undeveloped natural resources, is opening up as a new land of opportunity and an inviting frontier for the young and enterprising. It is expected that large numbers of veterans will seek their postwar fortunes there. Statehood would greatly aid in the full development of this rich land.

Both Hawaii and Alaska are in fact today full fledged partners in these United States.

A prompt granting of statehood to them would be no more than recognition of that fact. There are considerable movements already started to do this in the coming session of Congress.

The 48 present States should wish well to these movements and look forward to an early welcome to two new sister States.

EXHIBIT 73E. PRESENTED BY RICHARD KAGEYAMA

NEWS CLIPPINGS

[Honolulu Star-Bulletin, January 21, 1944]

JAPANESE AMERICANS' WORK HERE PRAISED

Remington Stone, civilian assistant to the Army deputy district engineer for the central Pacific area, said last night that Japanese-Americans have contributed much to building of Hawaii's defense."

"Americans of Japanese descent as well as many Jap aliens helped in the construction crews," he said, "many crew foremen and workers were Japanese. All rumors of sabotage in the island were found to have no foundation when investigated."

[Honolulu Star-Bulletin, November 22]

PRESIDENT PRAISES RECORD OF AJA'S

President Roosevelt at his press conference Tuesday praised the performance of Japanese Americans fighting in Italy. He said they have a very wonderful record and one of the outstanding achievements of the war.

[Honolulu Star-Bulletin, December 29]

SECRETARY LAUDS AJA PATRIOTISM AS MAGNIFICENT

Secretary of Interior Harold L. Ickes said tonight American soldiers of Japanese ancestry have "fashioned a magnificent record of service," and told them "all good Americans are proud of you."

Ickes said the AJA fighting record demonstrated that Americanism isn't a matter of race or ancestry" and went on to say that removal of the west coast Japanese exclusion orders is well-earned recognition of the evacuees' loyalty "in the severest test any group of Americans has had to face.

Ickes termed it; "A victory for faith in the principles of real Americanism and unflinching patriotism, which is so well exemplified by thousand of valiant American soldiers from the mainland and Hawaii whose parents came from Japan."

[Honolulu Star-Bulletin, July 13]

PATTERSON LAUDS AJA COMBAT UNIT

Acting Secretary of War Robert Patterson today paid tribute to Japanese-Americans fighting in Italy, saying "A unit of Americans of Japanese descent, the Four Hundred Forty-second combat team, has done good work in the American sector in Italy."

[Honolulu Star-Bulletin, January 20]

ISLE JAPANESE GIVEN CLEAN BILL OF HEALTH

A "clean bill of health" for 160,000 Japanese-Americans in Hawaii has been given by intelligence officials in the islands, the New York Sun reported today in an editorial.

The editorial said:

"Visiting in Honolulu, a Baltimore Sun staff writer obtained from Col. Kendall J. Fielder, assistant chief of staff for military intelligence there, what may be called an unqualified clean bill of health for the conduct of 160,000 Japanese-Americans in Hawaii.

"It is true that on the day of the attack on Pearl Harbor and immediately thereafter a handful of Japanese Americans known to be disloyal were seized."

"More than 600 Japanese-Americans from Hawaii are serving as combat interpreters in various parts of the Pacific front. More than 10,000 Japanese-Americans volunteered for combat duty in the Army but only 2,645 could be accepted.

"Since the War Department long ago held that a large-scale evacuation of Japanese Americans from Hawaii would be impracticable it is fortunate that by testimony of a disinterested observer from the mainland the policy that has been followed has been successful, or at the very least, unmarked by incidents."

LETTER TRANSMITTING EXHIBIT 76

TERRITORIAL CENTRAL COMMITTEE,
REPUBLICAN PARTY OF HAWAII,
Honolulu I, T. H., January 15, 1946.

HON. HENRY LARCADE,
*Chairman, Subcommittee of Territorial Committee,
House of Representatives, Congress of the United States,
Investigating Statehood for Hawaii.*

SIR: On pages 557 to 559 of the record of the Hearings before the Joint Committee on Hawaii, Congress of the United States, Seventy-fifth Congress, second session, October 6 to 22, 1937, appears the National and Territorial party planks on statehood and self-government for 1900 to 1936.

Submitted herewith is compilation showing such planks from 1938 to 1944.

Very truly yours,

A. VITOUSEK, *Chairman.*

EXHIBIT 76. PRESENTED BY ROY A. VITOUSEK

National and local party planks on statehood and self-government

Year	Democratic		Republican	
	National	Local	National	Local
1938		"The Democratic Party in Hawaii reaffirms its strong belief that statehood is the ultimate destiny of the Territory. We pledge our candidates to support the holding of a plebiscite on the question of statehood."		"The efforts of our Delegate in Congress resulted in bringing to this Territory an outstanding joint congressional committee to study the subject of statehood for Hawaii. "The Republican Party, gratified with the report of the committee and convinced of the justness of the cause, will continue its efforts for statehood, and to that end advocate the provision be made by the legislature for an expression of public opinion on the subject."
1940	"We favor a larger measure of self-government leading to statehood for Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico. We favor the appointment of residents to office, and equal treatment of the citizens of each of these 3 Territories. We favor the prompt determination and payment of any just claims by Indians and Eskimos, citizens of Alaska against the United States."	"As real democratic progress is only possible with the power of government in the hands of the people, and in conformity with the consistent stand of the party since its local inception, we advocate statehood for Hawaii."	"Hawaii, sharing the Nation's obligations equally with the several States, is entitled to the fullest measure of home rule; and to equality with the several States in the right of her citizens and in the application of our national laws."	"The Republican Party favors statehood for Hawaii and believes that any hesitation in the adoption of statehood is un-American, undemocratic, and detrimental to the welfare of Hawaii and its people. We urge all members of the party and the public to cast an affirmative vote on the question to be submitted to them at the general election in November of 1940: 'Do you favor statehood for Hawaii?'"
1942		"We reiterate our oft-expressed advocacy of statehood as the ultimate destiny of Hawaii, and to the end that this aspiration may be achieved, in the light of world conditions, we pledge our continued support to the Hawaii Equal Rights Commission which has functioned so successfully and effectively for the past 7 years under our democratic administration, in its efforts to obtain equality of treatment with the States in all things until the time when Hawaii shall take her merited place in the sisterhood of the States. "This advocacy is in conformity with the platform of the Democratic Party pledges at its last national convention and we contend that the people of the Territory, since the 7th day of December, 1941, have shown by their every act in connection with the war effort the right to be admitted as a State in the Union."		"The right of self-government, the right of proportionate representatives, inheres in all peoples of democratic nations, and the Republican Party, cognizant of world conditions renews its pledge to preserve and foster these rights and every right for the people of the Territory of Hawaii to the fullest possible degree obtainable under American principles of government."

1944	<p>"We favor enactment of legislation granting the fullest measure of self-government for Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico, and eventual statehood for Alaska and Hawaii."</p>	<p>"We reiterate our oft-expressed advocacy of statehood as the ultimate destiny of Hawaii, and to the end that this aspiration may be achieved, in the light of world conditions, we pledge our continued support to the Hawaii Equal Rights Commission which has functioned so successfully and effectively for the past 9 years under our democratic administration, in its efforts to obtain equality of treatment with the States in all things until the time when Hawaii shall take her merited place in the sisterhood of States.</p> <p>"This advocacy is in conformity with the platform of the Democratic Party pledged at its last national convention, and we believe that the record of this Territory since the outbreak of war has shown that we are entitled to immediate statehood."</p>	<p>"Hawaii, which shares the Nation's obligations equally with the several States, is entitled to the fullest measure of home rule looking toward statehood; and to equality with the several States in the rights of her citizens and the application of all our national laws."</p>	<p>"The Republican Party reaffirms its position that the Territory of Hawaii is in every way qualified for and entitled to admission into the Union as a State. We pledge ourselves to continue to work for statehood, and until that be accomplished we will devote our efforts toward preserving for the people of this Territory the freedom of home rule under civilian administration without impairment of their endeavors to help win the war."</p>
------	---	--	---	--

EXHIBIT 78B. PRESENTED BY THE HONOLULU JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

FACTUAL STATEMENT SUPPORTING THE RESOLUTION OF THE HONOLULU JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE ENDORSING IMMEDIATE STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII

The Honolulu Junior Chamber of Commerce, an organization of young men, has the same purpose organizational set-up and method of operation as does all member chapters of the national organization. The Honolulu Junior Chamber of Commerce and all of its members are members of the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce. The membership is a cross section of Honolulu's new generation of community leaders.

This presentation has been prepared in order to acquaint the committee with the type of young men who are rising to positions of leadership in the community. Their qualifications for leadership, and the relationship of the qualities and qualifications of these men to Hawaii's fitness for statehood, is evidenced in their accomplishments in many fields of community activity, as is borne out in the records of the Honolulu Junior Chamber of Commerce.

There are now 272 members in the Honolulu Junior Chamber of Commerce; one-sixth of them own their own businesses. More than half, 146, were born in the mainland United States; 107 were born in Hawaii, and 19 were born in other countries. All are American citizens. Nearly half, 133, attended mainland colleges. This figure, which shows a majority of mainland-born members, tends to indicate that the young leaders of the community are not provincial in their outlook. They have had experience on the mainland, most of them during their early adult life, and are familiar with the functioning of American democracy in the States.

Junior chamber members receive, in the organization, an opportunity to develop administrative and management ability.

During the past fiscal year, the junior chamber of commerce handled nearly \$100,000, which was spent or earmarked for community welfare during the period. Assets, on November 30, 1945, totaled \$23,311.12.

The program of the junior chamber, which parallels the programs of the junior chamber organization on the mainland, is typically American. It includes:

1. SUPPORT FOR PUBLIC HEALTH

At present, the Hawaiian Junior Chamber of Commerce, an organization to which all junior chambers in the Territory belong and which corresponds to State junior chamber organizations on the mainland, is conducting a cancer-control program in Hawaii for the American Cancer Control Society. Within the past month, funds were provided for a cancer-education program in the public high schools.

During the 1945 session of the Territorial legislature, the Honolulu Junior Chamber of Commerce assisted in the presentation of successful legislation providing for premarital examinations and combating the rat and mosquito menaces.

The junior chamber of commerce is represented on the public health committee of the Chamber of Commerce of Honolulu and on the Oahu Health Council.

2. SUPPORT FOR BETTER PUBLIC EDUCATION

The education committee of the junior chamber took an active part in shaping proposed legislation during the 1945 session of the legislature which strengthened the department of public instruction.

It joined forces with other organizations interested in better education which, working in concert, were able to obtain favorable consideration for a large part of a progressive, far-reaching education program.

The education committee is now completing arrangements to provide vocational guidance for high-school students in cooperation with the department of public instruction. Qualified business and professional men and skilled craftsmen will be available to inform students of job requirements and opportunities in the community.

The education committee has, for a period of years, sponsored a Territory-wide school oratorical contest; with the organization of the Hawaiian Junior Chamber of Commerce, the Territorial finals are now conducted by the Territorial body, and island finals are conducted by the junior chamber units on each island.

The theme of these contests, which experience a consciousness of our responsibilities as Americans, has been "The Constitution of the United States," with the exception of the year 1945, when the emergence of the Pacific area as a result of the war suggested last year's topic: "The future of Hawaii in the Pacific area."

The education committee also sponsors, each year, the observance of Library Week, in cooperation with the Library of Hawaii, a government-supported institution.

3. SUPPORT FOR AN ACTIVE PROGRAM OF AMERICANISM

The Americanism committee annually sponsors "I Am an American Day" in Honolulu. Local response to this program has proved identical to that of any mainland American community.

4. ACTIVE INTEREST IN GOVERNMENT

The Territorial and municipal affairs committee keeps abreast of the operation of the city and Territorial governments and provides constructive assistance in the sponsorship of progressive legislation.

The committee is planning a get-out-the-vote program this year, beginning with a drive to register eligible voters. The junior chamber units throughout the Territory have been active in get-out-the-vote campaigns in the past.

5. REPRESENTATION IN GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS

A resolution of the Hawaiian Junior Chamber of Commerce in 1944 urged junior chamber members to take an active and personal interest in government and to offer themselves for public office.

A number of members of the junior chamber hold Federal, Territorial, and municipal government positions and are presently serving on various government commissions. They include: (1) Director of Territory civil service; (2) director of personnel department of public health; (3) assistant city and county attorney; (4) manager, Hawaii War Finance Committee; (5) member, city and county taxi commission; (6) member, city and county planning commission; (7) member, city and county traffic safety commission; (8) member, Territorial institutions commission.

6. CLOSE COOPERATION WITH THE ARMED FORCES

The junior chamber of commerce has cooperated with the armed forces in some of its major projects and on many occasions they have cooperated on problems of mutual interest.

Among the recent functions sponsored by the junior chamber was a Luau for a group of RAMP's (Recovered American Military Personnel) en route home from Japanese prison camps. This function was attended by high-ranking Army and Navy officers and was addressed by Admiral of the Fleet William F. Halsey.

The junior chamber sponsored a newspapers-for-servicemen campaign until inadequate shipping space compelled the armed forces to cut down the number of civilian papers sent to Pacific outposts and to give space priorities to service publications, such as Yanks and Stars and Stripes. Over 1,200,000 newspapers were flown to servicemen based on the various outposts of the Pacific.

During the war the junior chamber provided a special membership classification for servicemen, as was the case in all America's communities; many of its own members were in the armed forces.

An active program to assist returned veterans is conducted in such a way as not to conflict with government-sponsored programs.

7. SUPPORT FOR AMERICAN SPORTS

The junior chamber of commerce has sponsored baseball, football, and other games, tennis tournaments, yacht races, swimming meets, and other competitive athletics of a distinctly American flavor in a distinctly American manner.

Considerable emphasis has been given to swimming, and Hawaii's recent return to national prominence in this sport is due, in part, to the activity of the junior chamber in reactivating interest and sponsoring swimming competition. Hawaii's swimming stars, as members of the last American olympic team, helped to establish our national prestige in the field of international sports.

Competition in various sports events with mainland teams, both here and on the mainland, has provided contacts which have tended to hasten the Americanization of these islands and to acquaint our young people with the attributes of other American athletes.

8. SUPPORT FOR THE COMMUNITY CHEST

In cooperation with other organizations, the junior cahmber of commerce has helped each year to raise funds for the operation of the community chest organizations. In 1945 junior chamber teams raised \$59,356 in a relatively underprivileged area which, when given the opportunity to share in this undertaking, responded wholeheartedly.

9. RODEO

A member of the Rodeo Association of America, the Honolulu Junior Chamber of Commerce has sponsored two successful Rodeo Association of America's approved rodeos. This type of competition, typically American, has brought to the people of Hawaii the spirit of the western range.

10. SUPPORT FOR TRAFFIC SAFETY

The junior chamber has conducted the fleet safety contest for commercial vehicles and has conducted a number of traffic-safety campaigns. As a continuing project, the junior chamber maintains a flagpole in the civic square, from which a national safety flag flies on each day that a traffic death is recorded in Oahu.

11. YOUTH WELFARE PROGRAM

The youth welfare projects include sponsorship of the *Eskbank*, the Nation's First Sea Scout ship. From this Sea Scout ship grew the whole Nation-wide Sea Scout program, and later the Senior Scout program, a contribution to American youth of which Hawaii is proud.

The youth welfare committee also supports the junior symphony orchestra and sponsors Christmas parties each year for needy children.

12. CHRISTMAS MUSIC FESTIVAL

Last year the junior chamber of commerce inaugurated a Christmas music festival which was well received by the community. A 400-voice choir, including Army, Navy, marines, men and women, civilians composed of Americans of different ancestry—Hawaiian, Chinese, Portuguese, Japanese, Negro, etc., participated in this event.

Other Christmas activities, in addition to the parties for needy children, included a project to arrange for civilians to invite servicemen to their homes for Christmas celebrations.

13. HUMAN RELATIONS

The Hawaiian Junior Chamber of Commerce has in effect a program aimed at minimizing prejudice and eliminating discrimination.

The Honolulu Junior Chamber of Commerce human relations committee, which is charged with combating prejudice and discrimination, has found no evidence of political discrimination and very little evidence of economic discrimination in Honolulu, or elsewhere in the Territory.

14. PRODUCTS SHOW

Before the war, the junior chamber of commerce sponsored a series of annual products shows, giving business firms an opportunity to display their wares and providing wholesome entertainment and educational features for the public.

This year, in addition to a proposed revival of the products show, the junior chamber of commerce is planning a county fair, which will parade the agricultural products of Hawaii and demonstrate what has been done, is being done, and what is being planned for the future of agriculture in Hawaii.

15. AWARDS

Since 1940 the Honolulu Junior Chamber of Commerce has entered the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce awards competition each year; and, in

competition with 800 junior chamber organizations throughout the mainland, has received the following national awards:

1940: Public health, first place.

1941:

Sports, first place.

Development of cultural projects, first place.

Profit making, second place.

Project of the year, second place.

1942:

Profit making, second place.

War service, third place.

1943:

Sports and recreation, first place.

Public relations, first place.

1944:

Profit making, first place.

Civic welfare funds, second place.

Public relations, second place.

1945: Sports and recreation, third place.

In addition to these activities, the junior chamber conducts a full educational, sports, entertainment, and social program for its own members.

It is our belief that this program is typical of the programs of junior chamber organizations in cities of comparable size on the mainland and demonstrates that the Jaycees of Honolulu and the rest of Hawaii have been and are getting the training in civic responsibility and leadership that will insure for the future a progressive modern community, and one which other American communities would be proud to welcome into the sisterhood of States.

EXHIBIT 79A. PRESENTED BY THE HAWAII EQUAL RIGHTS COMMISSION

Hourly wage in pineapple industry of Hawaii compared with that of the general food industry on the mainland

HOURS AND EARNINGS IN MANUFACTURING AND NONMANUFACTURING INDUSTRIES¹

	Average hourly earnings											
	1944				1945							
	Sep-tem-ber	Octo-ber	Nov-em-ber	Dec-em-ber	Janu-ary	Feb-ru-ary	March	April	May	June	July	Aug-ust
Average for food industry included ¹	84.7	85.7	85.9	86.6	86.6	86.1	86.4	87.0	87.7	87.8	87.4	88.2
Canning and preserving industry ¹	76.4	79.0	77.3	78.6	79.5	79.4	78.8	79.1	81.1	79.8	78.2	82.2

Data taken from Monthly Labor Reviews, U. S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

¹ Prepared by Pineapple Growers Association.

Hourly wage in pineapple industry

Average hourly wage in Honolulu canneries for last fiscal year:	<i>Cents per hour</i>
Males.....	94.76
Females.....	69.61
Average hourly wage in canneries on islands other than Oahu:	
Males.....	79.76
Females.....	62.12

EXHIBIT 79B. PRESENTED BY HAWAII EQUAL RIGHTS COMMISSION

Average annual earnings of all regular hourly rate employees on pay roll during the past year—average earnings for seasonal workers in canneries are also given.¹

Kind and place of employment	Weighted average annual earnings of all hourly rate employees	
	Regular year-round employees	Seasonal employees 6 to 10 weeks ²
Honolulu canneries:		
Male.....	\$2,593.18	\$417.78
Female.....	1,611.75	350.16
Canneries on islands other than Oahu:		
Male.....	1,902.52	230.00
Female.....	1,388.73	157.10
Plantations: ³		
Male.....	⁴ 1,641.26	-----
Female.....	⁴ 1,010.73	-----

¹ Includes Hawaiian canneries and Kauai pineapple plantations on Kauai; those operations which the California Packing Corp., Libby, McNeill & Libby, and Hawaiian Pineapple Co. may have on Oahu, Molokai, or Maui; and the Maui Pineapple Co. and Baldwin Packers on Maui.

² Length of seasonal employment in canneries varies on the different islands from 6 to 10 weeks depending on various factors affecting ripening, harvesting, and processing of fruit.

³ Figures for island of Lanai not obtained but average annual earnings of plantation workers would be very similar to average annual earnings of other plantations owned by the same company.

⁴ Plantation employees in addition to earnings shown are also furnished dwellings, fuel, medical care, and other perquisites. Women employed on the plantations often prefer to work only part time, thus resulting in a relatively low annual income for such workers.

Prepared by Pineapple Growers' Association.

EXHIBIT 80. PRESENTED BY THE HAWAII EQUAL RIGHTS COMMISSION

Schedule of real property area of Federal Government in the Territory, 1934 and 1945¹

	Acres	Percent		Acres	Percent
1934, total area.....	206,870	5.02	1945, total area.....	226,870	5.51
Parks.....	164,205	3.98	Parks.....	164,205	3.98
U. S. Army.....	30,090	-----	U. S. Army.....	33,290	-----
U. S. Navy.....	11,940	-----	U. S. Navy.....	28,590	-----
Others.....	635	-----	Others.....	785	-----
Federal area (other than parks).....	42,665	1.04	Federal area (other than parks).....	62,665	1.53

¹ See exhibits 36, 43, and 44 relating to land holdings.

NOTE.—Total area of Territory, 4,118,400 acres.

Federal holdings other than parks, increased from 42,665 acres in 1934 to 62,665 acres in 1945, or 20,000 acres, which is 46.87 percent of the 1934 figure.

WM. BORTHWICK, *Tax Commissioner.*

HONOLULU, T. H., January 11, 1946.

EXHIBIT 81. PRESENTED BY THE HAWAII EQUAL RIGHTS COMMISSION

Tax collections, Territory of Hawaii, calendar year 1945¹

Real property.....	\$6,568,605.43
Personal property.....	3,697,620.65
Income, personal and corporation.....	3,529,447.21
Public utility.....	1,897,497.05
Liquid fuel.....	1,932,749.57
Compensation and dividend.....	8,819,507.92
Bank excise.....	50,000.00
Liquor.....	1,908,979.50
Tobacco.....	422,664.86
Gross income and consumption.....	10,460,310.25
Unemployment compensation.....	1,888,749.18
Business excise, poll, public welfare (prior years).....	96,468.83
Administered by tax commissioner.....	41,272,600.45
Inheritance and estate.....	661,274.16
Insurance.....	451,472.58
Miscellaneous licenses.....	10,252.63
Administered by territorial treasurer.....	1,122,999.37
Total.....	42,395,499.82

¹ Does not include collections by the counties (see chs. 107, 108, 133, and 134, and sec. 6672, Revised Laws of Hawaii, 1945) or by the public utilities commission (see ch. 82, Revised Laws of Hawaii, 1945) or Territorial boxing commission (see ch. 145, Revised Laws of Hawaii, 1945). See exhibit 5e showing the tax structure, and exhibit 45d showing miscellaneous collections and showing how revenues are distributed.

EXHIBIT 85. PRESENTED BY C. NILS TAVARES

REPORT BY CAPT. RAY MADISON RELATING TO JUVENILE DELINQUENCY, ISLANDS OF MAUI, HAWAII AND KAUAI

CITY AND COUNTY OF HONOLULU,
POLICE DEPARTMENT,

HON. NILS TAVARES,
Attorney General, Territory of Hawaii,
Honolulu 16, T. H., January 18, 1946.
Honolulu, T. H.

DEAR MR. TAVARES: As per your request for information on January 17, 1946, I contacted by interisland telephone the chiefs of police, Jean Lane, of Maui, and George Larsen, of Hawaii, as to the juvenile-delinquency problems of their counties. For the island of Kauai, I was able, from Mr. Price, who formerly handled all the probation work for boys and who is now in Honolulu, to get the same information.

Reports from these islands seem on the whole to indicate no rising or increasing problem. Kauai has found they experienced a considerable drop in rate in 1942 (as did all of us) with a gradual rise in 1943 to about prewar years; 1944 and 1945 show no appreciable increase—with the rate of repeaters actually lower.

Maui indicates they handled about 500 cases which roughly parallels the 521 cases handled in 1944.

Chief Larsen, of Hawaii, stated that they expect their 1945 statistics to show about a 5-percent decrease over 1944 (which latter year was slightly higher than 1943). There has been recently a reorganization of the Hawaii Police Department which may account for increased activity in apprehension and handling.

For a long-term picture of trends, there are few indexes that are reliable for comparison of the various islands. One of these is the material of juvenile court cases. While such statistics are open to criticism, they do give a rough estimate on the comparison of delinquency on all the islands. Included here is a table from Norman C. Smith's survey of 1942 of Maui Youth Adrift (exhibit 86).

Some delinquency experts contend that rural areas will always shows a lower recorded rate of delinquency than will urban areas. They attribute this to the fact that it is easier for children to adjust to simple country life, that not much official cognizance is taken of delinquent acts where there is a close community bond, and that in the absence of available agencies for treatment, the community attempts to deal with such problems informally.

Respectfully yours,

RAY MADISON,

Captain, Crime Prevention Division, Honolulu Police Department.

EXHIBIT 86. PRESENTED BY C. NILS TAVARES

Table from Norman C. Smith's survey of 1942 (from Maui Youth Adrift) relating to trend of juvenile delinquency

	Rate of delinquency per thousand population by islands, Territory of Hawaii											
	First circuit (Oahu, Kalawao)			Second circuit (Maui, Lanai, Molokai)			Third and fourth circuits (Hawaii)			Fifth circuit (Kauai)		
	Population	Cases	Rate of delinquency	Population	Cases	Rate of delinquency	Population	Cases	Rate of delinquency	Population	Cases	Rate of delinquency
			Pct.			Pct.			Pct.			Pct.
1930.....	204,195	449	2.19	55,541	49	0.88	73,785	21	0.28	36,166	65	1.80
1931.....	206,500	441	2.14	58,008	29	.50	75,632	53	.70	37,177	159	4.28
1932.....	207,795	458	2.20	58,507	63	1.08	76,177	39	.51	37,369	111	2.97
1933.....	207,348	327	1.58	58,400	50	.86	76,033	46	.61	37,238	77	2.08
1934.....	208,807	450	2.16	58,685	32	.55	76,321	227	2.99	37,338	71	1.90
1935.....	213,736	400	1.87	59,576	39	.65	77,282	51	.65	37,742	47	1.25
1936.....	217,833	442	2.03	60,340	55	.91	78,161	23	.29	38,140	35	.92
1937.....	222,974	546	2.45	61,779	62	1.00	79,720	36	.45	39,104	54	1.38
1938.....	227,863	611	2.68	63,276	77	1.22	81,453	41	.50	40,134	44	1.11
1939.....	255,952	589	2.30	55,527	58	1.04	73,311	88	1.20	35,808	38	1.06
1940.....	258,256	613	2.37	55,534	63	1.13	73,276	118	1.61	35,818	65	1.82
11-year average.....			2.19			.89			.88			1.85

EXHIBIT 87. PRESENTED BY C. NILS TAVARES

Individual juveniles charged during 1945 by the crime prevention division of the Honolulu Police Department.

PART I. OFFENSES

	Male	Female	Total
First offense.....	226	33	259
Repeaters.....	419	25	444
Total.....	645	58	703

PART II. OFFENSES

First offense.....	838	193	1,031
Repeaters.....	638	175	813
Total.....	1,476	368	1,844
Total I and II.....	2,121	426	2,547

Individual juveniles charged during 1945 by the crime prevention division of the Honolulu Police Department—Continued

PART II. OFFENSES—Continued

	Individuals	Times charged	First offenders (referred once each)	Repeaters	Times referred
1943.....	2, 498	3, 609	1, 255	1, 203	2, 354
1944.....	2, 104	3, 166	1, 022	1, 082	2, 144
1945.....	2, 547	3, 696	1, 289	1, 258	2, 407

Prepared by Capt. Ray Madison.

EXHIBIT 88. PRESENTED BY C. NILS TAVARES

Individual juveniles charged during 1945 and referred by the crime prevention division of the Honolulu police department—Continued
Individual juveniles charged during 1945 and referred by the crime prevention division of the Honolulu police department

PART I. OFFENSES

Total	Individuals		Times referred	Referrals			Referred to—															
							Counseled and released by CPD members usually to parents		Child and family service		Department of public welfare (dependents and delinquents under 12)		Department of institutions parole violators and escapees of training schools		Juvenile courts		Other agency ¹		Other court ²		Pupil guidance division of department of institutions	
	Male	Female		Total	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
526	486	40	1	526	486	40	192	20	10	0	16	3	20	1	223	16	15	0	2	0	8	0
153	148	5	2	306	296	10	23	0	8	0	5	0	5	0	104	5	3	0	0	0	0	0
81	70	11	3	243	210	33	5	0	8	1	3	2	1	1	51	7	1	0	1	0	0	0
31	30	1	4	124	120	4	0	0	0	1	3	0	1	0	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
12	12	0	5	60	60	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4	3	0	6	24	18	6	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	1	0	7	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	2	0	9	18	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	1	0	10	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	1	0	15	15	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
812	754	58	-----	1,333	1,240	93	221	20	28	2	31	6	27	2	417	28	19	0	3	0	8	0

PART II. OFFENSES

1,722	1,395	327	1	1,722	1,395	327	675	108	10	19	11	7	18	12	656	170	13	5	1	3	11	3
211	155	56	2	422	310	112	28	10	0	0	5	0	3	1	116	45	3	0	0	0	0	0
50	35	15	3	150	105	45	1	2	0	2	2	0	0	0	32	11	0	0	0	0	0	0
14	10	4	4	56	40	16	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	10	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	1	0	5	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	1	0	8	8	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1,999	1,597	402	-----	2,363	1,863	500	704	121	10	22	18	7	21	13	816	228	16	5	1	3	11	3
2,811	2,351	460	-----	3,696	3,103	593	925	141	38	24	49	13	48	15	1,233	256	35	5	4	3	19	3

¹ Includes Boy Scouts, Catholic charities, merchant marine (ship's captain), and Salvation Army.

² Shore patrol, military police, H. T. G., mental health clinic.

³ Some individuals referred to more than 1 agency.

Prepared by Capt. Ray Madison.

EXHIBIT 93. PRESENTED BY CHAUNCEY B. WIGHTMAN

HOME OWNERSHIP BY SUGAR PLANTATION EMPLOYEES

On January 8, 1946, Mr. Chauncey B. Wightman, secretary of the Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association, testified before the Congressional Statehood Committee. The question was asked by a member of the committee as to what proportion of sugar workers own their own homes. Mr. Wightman stated in reply to this question that a great majority of the plantation employees live in houses which are furnished by the plantations and further stated that definite information would be submitted.

An examination of our records reveals that a total of 3,365 men, women, and children, which includes family groups and single employees, live in 596 houses which are not supplied or owned by the plantations but which are rented or owned by the plantation employees. The figures reveal that on an average only 5.6 persons occupy one house.

CHAUNCEY B. WIGHTMAN, *Secretary.*

Census of houses on sugar plantations in Hawaii

	Number of employees	Number of houses
Employees in plantation-owned houses.....	61,553	16,001
Employees in houses not owned but supplied free by plantations.....	1,130	364
Employees living in houses not owned or supplied by plantations.....	3,365	596
Nonemployees in plantation houses who do not work for plantations.....	6,059	817
Planters living in other than plantation houses.....	1,486	252
Total.....	73,593	18,030

Of the 18,030 houses, 16,818 are plantation-owned houses, 364 are supplied free by plantations, and 848 are other than plantation-owned houses.

Source: Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association 1945 census of Hawaiian sugar plantations.

EXHIBIT 94. PRESENTED BY CHAUNCEY B. WIGHTMAN

Average daily and estimated annual cash earnings of unskilled adult male employees on Hawaiian sugar plantations

Average daily cash earnings of unskilled adult male employees on Hawaiian sugar plantations during the 5-month period, July to November, 1945.

(Latest figures available.) This figure does not include the value of perquisites furnished all such employees. These perquisites include homes, garden space, medical care for workers and immediate family, fuel and light allowances, garbage collection, and recreational facilities.....¹

Estimated average annual cash earnings of unskilled adult male employees (does not include value of perquisites) based on an average of 300 8-hour days worked per year..... 1,530

¹ Per 8-hour day.

INDEX

	Page
Agriculture-----	88-100, 686-694
Americans of Japanese ancestry.....	243-245, 255-256, 400-403, 457-460, 597-599, 893
"Big Five"-----	112-114, 133-134, 138-139, 222-236, 359, 474, 483-484, 783, 821
Bloc voting-----	134-135, 330-332, 336, 338, 360, 474
Business-----	419-422, 668-677, 699, 875
Citizenship-----	345-346
City and county of Honolulu-----	207-212, 566-563
Civilian defense activities-----	47-54, 551-558, 599-606
Education-----	45-56, 334, 390-391, 394-397, 519-520, 571-572, 584-593, 715-720
Elections-----	28-30, 178-183, 331, 528-529, 721-725
Employment-----	119-122, 741
Federal expenditures-----	317-392, 396, 660-662
Finance-----	205-206, 763-769
Government of Hawaii-----	175-177
Hawaii-----	12-18
Hawaiian Homes Commission-----	269-275, 297-302, 305-312, 321-322, 573-575
Health-----	69-87, 560, 725, 828-830, 834
Housing-----	143-147
Internal revenue-----	287-289, 658-659
Japanese-----	243-246,
Labor-----	122-131, 565-566, 625-632, 696-714
Land-----	172-173, 217-222, 237-238, 275-282, 315-316, 745-746, 748, 759-762,
	155-168,
	172-173, 217-222, 237-238, 275-282, 315-316, 745-746, 178, 759-762,
	770-782, 902.
Laws-----	576-584
Law endorsement-----	594-597, 835
Newspapers-----	826
Parks-----	353-355
Pineapple industry-----	101-108, 323-324, 561-563, 685-686, 901
Political parties-----	55-68
Population-----	55-68, 559-560, 653-655
Public utilities-----	575-576, 680
Public works-----	148-154
Reapportionment-----	181-182, 242-243, 489-490, 495-495, 641-642
Statehood:	
For-----	9,
	18-20, 23-26, 284-287, 289-292, 295-296, 310, 361, 372-373, 381-389,
	408-413, 446-450, 465-470, 523-526, 537-538.
Against-----	242-250,
	254-266, 366-367, 430-432, 436-439, 443-446, 451-457, 461-462, 481-
	491.
Sugar industry-----	108-117, 416-418, 563-564, 683-684, 908
Taxation-----	183-204, 635-638, 665, 827, 903
Transportation-----	423-428, 609-621, 825
Water-----	307-309, 312-314